PHILOSOPHY

THE JOURNAL OF THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY

VOL. XIII. No. 51. JULY, 1938

THE CONCEPTS OF POLITICS

J. D. MABBOTT, M.A., B.LITT.

A RECENT letter to the Press counselled caution on the return of the German colonies on the grounds that Germany was a notoriously ungrateful nation. A few years after we presented Heligoland to her, the Kruger telegram showed her ready to encourage our enemies. Why should we now make her further gifts which would merely render more effective similar treachery? Clearly behaviour like this by an individual would warrant such an attitude. If I give a man a present on Monday and on Tuesday he stabs me in the back, I shall look with suspicion on his suggestion that I should make him further gifts next week. Yet the easy use of the word "Germany" here conceals a host of problems. Was the government which negotiated the return of Heligoland responsible for the Kruger telegram, or did the Kaiser send it on his own initiative? Was the German people "behind" the government or the Kaiser when the telegram was sent? Does the present government of Germany necessarily resemble the pre-war government? Is the German people to be held responsible for what its present government does? Only if all these questions are answered in one way is the prediction plausible or the condemnation justified. The moral is that until statements about "Germany" are rewritten so as to become statements about the German Government or the German people, accusations of ingratitude and bad faith have no intelligible or verifiable meaning. This in turn should make us wonder whether "Germany" is the name of an entity which has characteristics of its own at all. Another letter to the Press some time ago began: "General diabetic opinion demands . . ." Is "General diabetic opinion" the name of a moral agent who, like General Franco, can make demands,

be angry when they are thwarted, and grateful when they are granted? Clearly not. Yet if there is no reality in these corporate units, how are we to explain loyalty and the sentiment of national honour?

It is clear that some analysis of our social terms is necessary before we can be sure we are not being misled by false analogies. This analysis is the special contribution philosophy can make to the study of politics. It is for historians to determine the year in which Heligoland was ceded and the circumstances in which the Kruger telegram was dispatched. But when the facts are established alternative methods of stating them are possible and the philosopher can consider these methods, elicit their implications, and thus indirectly shed light on the justice of moral approval or condemnation which the facts evoke.

There is, of course, one system of politics which takes literally the unity and personality of the corporate body. Hegelian principle and totalitarian practice are unequivocal here. The State, its will, and its good, are paramount over the individual, his will, and his good. The individual is the abstraction, the unreality. He is but an instrument or an organ of the purposes of the State. Other groups, such as Churches, Universities, and Trade Unions, are also subservient parts of the national whole. I do not intend to attack this theory directly. Instead I wish to criticize some of its critics in order that the terms we use may be more clearly understood. The terms I wish particularly to examine are "Society" and "common good."

It is said by some of those who attack Hegel and his followers that he is right in requiring that all moral effort and all organized corporations should serve "the common good," but that his view of the common good is too narrow when he limits this service to service of the state; or, again, that the mistake was to attribute to the state characteristics which really belong to "Society." It is Society which demands our devotion. Church and University are not parts (still less servants) of the state, but they are parts of Society, and their function is her service. What is this entity, "Society," whose good we should all promote and whose instruments are those associations which the totalitarian state wrongly tries to control? I find three main answers to this question. None of them is clearly expressed or continuously maintained by its upholders, for complete clarity and consistency would, I think, dispose of "Society" in these senses altogether.

The first line of attack on Hegel is laid open when it is observed that I have duties towards members of another state. I should pay my German bookseller; I should tell the truth to a Frenchman whom I meet in Austria. If these duties are to be connected with a "common good" or these men are to be thought of as sharing with me a social

life, then "Society," that unit of which we are all three members, must be wider than the nation. It must include all those men with whom I am actually related. Theories of this type differ in their answer to the question whether the relationship need be conscious or not. Maciver, whose views we shall consider further below, tends to imply that they are conscious, when he speaks of "all *willed* relationships."[1] Graham Wallas includes unconscious relationships. He would include as members of the "Great Society" those whose actions affect me economically—men, for instance, whose wage-rate alters my baker's bill, even though I have never heard of them.[2] There are, however, men with whom I am in no actual relationship and yet towards whom I may have duties—men yet unborn, for instance—and to include all those to whom under any possible circumstances I might have a duty we cannot stop short of the whole human race. All men, then, would together constitute that "Great Society" to which I really owe allegiance and whose good I ought to promote. This on the whole is the view of T. H. Green, which we shall also consider later in more detail. But all human beings do not together constitute a society. Their similarity does not in any literal sense unite them. If similarity could do so, then all red-haired men would be a society and all rheumatics another. This leads to the third solution. The whole of humanity is not a society, but it ought to be. Then when I pay my German or enlighten my Frenchman I treat them as members of that ideal society which would be realized if all men served one common good and were determined in their actions by these principles of truth and fair-dealing. This, I think, is the view of Mr. Joseph.[3] Green also approximates to it occasionally, though he thinks the ideal is already partially achieved.[4] In order to bring out the difficulties in all these answers I shall consider in detail the accounts of "Society" given by Maciver, Cole, and Green.

Maciver begins his book, *Community*, with an attack on the inaccuracy of our sociological terminology. He proposes to distinguish three terms—society, community, and association—and to attach to each a special and accurate meaning. "Society I intend to use in a universal or generic sense to include every willed relationship of man to man; community, state, and association as special kinds or aspects of social fact."[5] This ought to mean that "society" is a general term, the name given to any group of men who stand in a willed relationship to each other, and that communities, states and associations are all societies of different kinds, so that there will be as many societies in the world as there are communities *plus*

[1] *Community*, p. 22. [2] *The Great Society*, ch. i.
[3] *Some Problems in Ethics*, ch. ix, especially pp. 118, 119.
[4] *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §§ 259, 280. [5] *Community*, p. 22.

states *plus* associations. In the same way "colour" is a generic term whose species are red, blue, etc., or "automobile" with its species private car, lorry, omnibus, etc. But Maciver's further use of the term "Society" issues partly in an awkward extension of the meaning, and, more seriously, in a logical confusion. For as his definition shows, he must regard me and my German bookseller as constituting one society, and me and my Frenchman another. This, however, is so obviously a misuse of language as to confuse rather than to clarify social theory. What is more fatal is that Maciver often writes and sometimes thinks as if "Society" were a *singular* and not a *general* term, as if there were only one entity whose name was "Society," but many states, associations, etc. There are traces of this confusion even in his definition, quoted above, where he says that society "includes" associations or that they are "aspects" of it. Colour does not include blue nor is blue an aspect of colour. Maciver is here slipping over from the relation between genus and species which is harmless to that between whole and part which is fatal. The confusion is, in fact, a very plausible and subtle instance of the Fallacy of Composition. The danger is clearest in such phrases as "Society is nothing more than individuals associated and organized."[1] or "Certain religious doctrines undermine the security of society,"[2] or "the interests of the individual are the interests of society."[3] It is an excellent danger signal of this fallacy when society is spelled with a capital letter. "To be the servant of Society" looks quite right, while "a club and a church are both Societies" is clearly wrong.[4] I have already insisted that there is no such entity as "Society" and, therefore, the singular term is illegitimate.

Maciver would defend the use of "society" as a general term on the ground that two of its species, communities and associations, are very different from each other and yet have enough in common to justify the general term "society" for any instance of either kind. To anticipate my conclusions, I do not consider a community to be any more a genuine unit than is "Society" itself. I find only one so-called species, the association, and I therefore have no need at all for "Society" even in its harmless generic sense. All societies are associations and "association" is a much safer name for them. If I am right, our practice of describing the doctor, the teacher, or the priest as "servants of Society," or "servants of the community," is one we can continue to follow only at our own peril—the peril of being led to imagine that "Society" and "the Community" are names of real entities as "doctor," "teacher," and "priest" are. These

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 69. [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 40. [3] *Op. cit.*, p. 90.

[4] Cf. Cole, *An Introduction to Social Theory*, ch. ii, where "Society" is spelled throughout with a capital and "community" with a small letter. Yet Cole intends both to be general terms, with many instances in each case.

public benefactors serve *men* and men only; and for the most part they serve them *as individuals*, and not as the members of any social unit whatever. When there is a social unit, it is an association, a school, church or university.

According to Maciver, the essential difference between a community and an association is that an association is organized and a community is not. A community is defined as "an *area* of common life, village, or town, or district, or country, or even wider area."[1] The common life "must have some characteristics of its own such that the frontiers of the area have some meaning."[2] (It is to be observed how even with "community" Maciver tends to beg his own questions.) "The common life" is regarded as a single subject which "has characteristics." Whereas what is meant is clearly that inhabitants of the area must have common characteristics so as to be distinguished from inhabitants of neighbouring areas. "The common life" does not speak a language, marry monogamously, inherit property in the male line, etc., and there are even traces of the still worse tendency to speak of "community," as of "Society," as if it were a singular term. "The state is an association within community,"[3] or "community is 'the world the spirit has made for itself' "[4] illustrate the confusion and the title of the book itself lends colour to it. It would be less misleading if the title were "The Community" or "Communities." A book on roses would not be called "Rose."[5]

Taking "community" as a general term, then, let us consider what Maciver says a community is. In the first place the insistence on "area" and "frontier" seems a mistake. Would Maciver deny that the Jews form a community? And his own instance immediately following his definition is equally unfortunate. The English residents in a foreign capital are a community, but he surely need not mean that they must live in an "English quarter." This, however, raises the crucial roblem, If "community" is not the name of a geographical area, what is the unit and what confers on it its unity? Similarity is not enough, otherwise all red-haired men would be a community and all rheumatics another. It is, of course, true that when we say "There is an English community in Florence" we mean more than "A number of Englishmen are domiciled in Florence." They must be aware of each other's existence and take some pleasure in each other's company because of their common nationality. (Even these minimal conditions do not seem to be fulfilled in another of Maciver's examples. He says that Western Europe is a community,[6]

[1] *Community*, p. 22. [2] *Loc. cit.*
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 39. [4] *Op. cit.*, p. 37.
[5] There are obviously equally difficult and interesting theological problems about the meanings of "The Church." [6] *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

but here the "common life" is obviously no more than mere similarity.)

To say that wherever certain phenomena occur we must postulate a special type of unit, we must find statements about the unit which are not immediately and obviously analysable into statements about the members. Maciver recognizes this and gives a list of epithets which belong to "communities," namely, "nomadic, barbarous, civilized, populous, warlike, or again caste-ridden, feudalized, industrialized."[1] We must recall, however, that the essential difference between a community and an association is that the latter is organized, the former not. But then "feudalized" and "caste-ridden" which describes organization must be characters of associations, not of communities. All the others, with one significant exception, are epithets which directly describe the inhabitants, and for their use no special social unit is necessary. The exception is "populous" and it proves the rule. It is true that an inhabitant could not be populous by himself, while he may be barbaric or nomadic. But if "populous" means numerous, then red-haired men would be a more populous community than rheumatic men; if it means having a high proportion of inhabitants to the area, then England north of a line from Trent to Severn could surely be more populous than England south of that line without either being constituted a community thereby. When we talk of the Jewish community (or the English community in Florence) we are merely attempting to say briefly that Jews resemble each other, find pleasure in each other's company, and tend to assist each other because of their similarity (or that the Englishmen in Florence have these characteristics). But these phenomena may result from any similarity. Tailors (and diabetics) are similar to each other in many ways and men naturally take an interest in and get on easily with those with whom they have much in common. But if we are to say that wherever such a group of facts is found we have a social unit of a special type, we shall be multiplying entities without necessity and finding ourselves compelled to include the diabetic community and the tailoring fraternity among them.

In his *Introduction to Social Theory* Mr. Cole devotes two chapters to an analysis of terms. He agrees with Maciver in his use of community, but he says that "every *community* may be regarded as giving rise to an organized *Society*."[2] A Society is "the complex of organized associations and institutions within the community."[3] It is surely clear that the justification of treating "a Society" so defined as a unit is entirely dependent on the interpretation of the word "complex." Let us allow for the moment that England is

[1] *Op. cit.* (Third Edition), Appendix A, p. 422.
[2] P. 25. [3] P. 29.

"a community." Then the Miners' Federation, monogamy, the M.C.C., hire-purchase and the Poultry Fanciers' Association are items in "the complex of associations and institutions" which is to be found in England. But in what sense do they together constitute a single unit? If Cole had said "aggregate" instead of "complex" the fallacy would be avoided, but the term "Society" would be abolished. It is also to be observed with what dangerous ease he passes from the view that a Society is made up of organized units to the suggestion that it is itself an organized unit. "Society is a complex of organized associations,"[1] then gives place to "Society is the sum total of organized social structure,"[2] and that seems in turn to justify "A *community* gives rise to an organized *Society*."[3] No doubt the state is itself "organized," but Cole would be the first to deny that the state includes churches, universities, etc.[4], and there is no other organized unit which does include them. I would therefore maintain that there is no defence in Cole for the use of this term "Society" as one of the types of unit with which sociology has to deal. I find neither in him nor in Maciver any necessity for the term at all. All its uses in all philosophers and political theorists seem to me dangerously misleading. I think the adjective "social" is harmless as describing relationships of all sorts between man and man. But its derivative "society" should be banished in the interests of clear thinking. Friendship and indebtedness are social relationships, but neither do friends nor do debtor and creditor compose societies.

Cole, as I said above, accepts Maciver's use of community. But he is more sensible than Maciver of the considerations I urged which would require the rejection of community as a social unit also. He sees that if we look at a community objectively—from the outside, as it were—it is hard to believe it is a unit at all. All we can discover is a number of men similar in customs and traditions, and able and ready to help one another because they are of a common race or talk the same language or worship the same idols. But Cole's remedy is not to give up "community" as a social unit, but to say it is a "subjective social unit." It is "a group felt by its members to be a real and operative unity."[5] "The reality of it *consists in* the consciousness of it among its members."[6] Now this is a very interesting additional point. It is not enough that Englishmen should be conscious that other Englishmen speak the same language, believe in monogamous marriage, dislike state-interference, etc. They must also believe in England—believe that there is a unity, believe that it is operative—and then, since in the end sociology is dealing with psychological facts, the belief will create the fact (as Tinker Bell is

[1] P. 29. [2] P. 30. [3] P. 25.
[4] See his article "Loyalties" (*Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 1925–26).
[5] P. 28. [6] P. 26. My italics.

kept alive in *Peter Pan* by the beliefs of the children in the audience). Now any full answer to this would lead us very deep into the metaphysics of thought and its object. The most I can do is to indicate by a parallel the error I think Cole is defending, and to show how the facts he could cite in its support may be otherwise explained. The error, then, of a sociologist who imports a "subjective social unit" seems to me like the error a theologian would make if he included the Devil as a theological reality with the proviso that he was a "subjective theological reality." Individual persons have believed in a Devil, yet the theologian may maintain that their evidence was poetry misinterpreted as history and that the belief itself involves great difficulties. Therefore the Devil is no reality at all. So I agree that individual persons have believed that their own races or "communities" were realities, but I think I can show the logical and psychological errors in which this belief originated and also the further errors to which it in turn would give rise. (Some of these will be mentioned below.) If men "feel their community as a real and operative unity," they are just wrong as an animistic savage is just wrong. Whenever they think it acts or suffers, the act or suffering is really that of individuals; whatever they believe about it is either a false belief about it or a disguised true belief about individuals. No doubt their belief that their race is a unit will make their actions different from what they would be without the belief, and it is just this difference which tempts the observer to believe that they constitute a unit of a new kind. But believers in a Devil or in a Banshee will also behave differently from non-believers, and yet their beliefs may be false.

I maintain then that neither in Maciver nor in Cole can we find any justification for the treatment of "society" or of "communities" as units. There is one type of social unit only, and that is the organized association. "Association" will then serve as our generic term with church, state, university, club, etc., as its species. It is clear that "society" would be the more natural name, but "association" avoids its misleading implications. For our temptations to say "We are all members of Society," or "we have duties to Society," or "We uphold the security of Society," would be removed if we substituted in these sentences the word "association" for the word "society." The accusation levelled against Hegel that he attributed to the State characteristics which really belong to Society must now be more accurately rewritten. He attributed to man's relation to the State certain rights and duties which hold between men as men and have no basis in any association, and also that the State was the only or at least the highest association, and he attributed to it both a supremacy over other associations and also the maintenance of institutions which they can more effectively maintain.

These conclusions are confirmed by an examination of the work of T. H. Green. He shows continually the struggles of a liberal individualist trying to avoid the conclusions of Hegel. He attempts to avert Hegelianism while preserving its central principle, by conceiving of a loyalty which is wider than the political loyalty because it is owed to a society larger than the State He regards moral progress as "the extension of the range of persons for whom the common good is conceived as common "[1] The Athenian did not recognize the rights of the foreigner, the Roman did not allow rights to the slave. Only with Christianity was the widening process complete. "The idea has been formed of the possible inclusion of all men in a society of equals and much has been done towards its realization."[2] Yet Green can speak in the same paragraph of "a duty of man to man as such and not merely as the member of a community." Here again is our confusion. If there are duties of man to man, the wider society, whether as an ideal or a reality, is unnecessary.[3] We may even find in Green the reasons why we may be tempted to speak of these social duties as if they were dependent on our recognition of our membership of some great society. "The language in which we most naturally express our conception of the duty of all men to all men indicates the school—that of tribal or civil or family obligation—in which we have been trained to the conception. We convey it in the concrete by speaking of a human family, of a fraternity of all men, of the common fatherhood of God, or we suppose a universal Christian citizenship, as wide as the Humanity for which Christ died, and in thought we transfer to this under certain analogical adaptations, those claims of one citizen upon another which have actually been enforced in societies united under a single sovereignty."[4] Now when we consider the changes by which the conception of city loyalty gave way to that of national loyalty in Greece, or those which accompanied the recognition of the rights of slaves, we find they were changes in the actual social units, the associations. The Greek cities lost their autonomy; slaves became citizens. The state actually enlarged its membership in both cases. If we now ask what is the ideal which Christianity requires as the associative expression of its recognition of the duties of all men to all men, we find once more that Green will not follow the logic of his own thought to its proper conclusion. For that movement should lead to the notion of a world state actually enforcing those wider

[1] *Prolegomena to Ethics*, § 206. [2] *Ibid.*, § 280.

[3] H. D. Lewis, in *Mind*, N.S. vol. xlvi, pp. 440 ff., exposes the same confusions in the assertion "rights are derived from society." I am in complete agreement with his argument, and his treatment of "rights" is, I think, parallel to my treatment above of duties, which was written before I saw his articles.

[4] *Op. cit.*, § 206.

duties by its single sovereignty, a state in which all men would be citizens and all nations should have lost their sovereignty as the slave-owner and the city state lost theirs.[1] What Green actually says, however, is this: "For those citizens of Christendom on whom the idea of Christendom has taken hold such a society does actually exist. For them—according to their conscientious conviction, if not according to their practice—mankind is a society of which the members owe reciprocal services to each other, simply as man to man. And the ideal of this social unity has been so far realized that the modern state, unlike the ancient, secures equality before the law to all persons living within the territory over which its jurisdiction extends and in theory at least treats aliens as no less possessed of rights."[2] We see here that Green envisages an alternative system and one in which a world state is not needed in order to express in actual institutions the duties of man to man. It would suffice if each state upheld within its own frontiers the rights and duties of men as men. This, however, is oddly described as " including all men in a society." It would be theoretically possible, for instance, for two states each to uphold these rights and duties and for the citizens of one to have no dealings with those of the other nor even to know of their existence. In what sense could both be said to belong to one society or to serve one "common good"?

Once again, then, I conclude that the use of "society" as the name of all mankind is unnecessary and misleading, and I return to my previous conclusion that the only type of social unit which need be recognized is the organized association. All statements about other aggregates of men—the lynching mob, the Jewish people, the Eskimo community, the human race, the tailoring fraternity—are reducible without remainder to statements about individual human beings. It might be supposed that there would follow from this the corollary that "common good" has also a double usage. It would be used illegitimately of all these fallacious units—community, society, crowd, etc.—for in those cases "common good" would reduce without remainder to the particular goods of individual people. But one would expect it to be used legitimately of the organized association, since we admit that the association is a genuine social unit. If this were so the good of humanity or the good of the Jewish race would be reducible simply to the good of individual men or individual Jews, but the good of the State, the Church, or the University would be genuine single goods not so reducible. I shall therefore go on to consider the senses in which "common good" is used.

(i) When we say that a "common good" has been achieved by

[1] Similarly, does a belief in the ideal of the unity of the Christian Church require unity of organization or not? [2] *Prolegomena to Ethics*, § 280.

a number of persons, we may mean merely that each has achieved for himself a good similar to that achieved, also for himself, by each of the others. Here the use of "common" or "general" is similar to that in phrases like "a general distrust" or "the common cold." If twelve men working independently acquire each some knowledge or a disease or anything else, their achievement does not turn them into a community or a society, nor is their good one good unless we are to say that two similar pillar-boxes are one pillar-box. This usage then is completely misleading, and if taken literally wholly indefensible.

(ii) We may, however, speak of a man as promoting the common good when he recognizes something as good and confers it on others, for instance when a doctor cures his patients. Here again, however, there is no community nor society, nor is there one good. The good—relief from pain—is enjoyed by individuals and produced by an individual for individuals. This usage also, though much more frequent and apparently more defensible, is equally dangerous and misleading.

(iii) In certain cases men achieve their own private ends, as in (i), and also assist other individuals to achieve theirs, as in (ii), by means of an organization which is genuinely one, and genuinely common to them all in a sense which the good it achieves is not. When you employ the same secretary as I do the secretary is not multiplied thereby, but when you catch my cold the result is two colds instead of one. So the health of a city may be achieved partly by each citizen consulting his own doctor, partly by the efforts of the Medical Officer of Health. The result is as many instances of health as there are citizens, but the means—in part at least—are communal and the same for all citizens. When an organization is used the good achieved is usually both extended and limited. It is extended to all members of the organization, but it is also limited to them. If a rich man is impressed by the suffering of certain children from lack of air and sunlight he may present a park to the town. The good he will do is then no longer limited to the particular children whom he first saw but extends to all children in the town. It will also be achieved not only so long as he keeps in mind their welfare, but will continue while he sleeps and after he has forgotten. Yet it may also be limited, for he may see suffering children in the next town and have no longer any funds for their relief. Now the phrase "common good" is still literally inapplicable. The good is a number of healthy children. But there is at last some justification for the belief that it does apply. For the children benefit *as members* of a single unit (the town) and, though the goods themselves are still private and many, the machinery (the park) is single and common. Each child has his own health, but each has not his own park nor

his own piece of park. Here, then, there are genuinely common factors and they make a difference to the incidence of the private goods.

(iv) In this last case the common machinery was an alternative method of achieving a private good which might have been achieved by private machinery. The rich man might have brought successive parties of children to his own park. In some cases, however, the machinery must be common if the ends are to be achieved at all. The ends secured by traffic control, credit regulation, or civil law are of this type. They cannot be achieved by private enterprise without organization. Yet even here "common good" is a misnomer. While what is common is essential to what is good, the machinery or organization (which is common) is not good and the safety and confidence (which are good) are not common.

(v) In all the previous cases the good achieved was the good of individual persons and the fact that one individual possessed the good made it intrinsically no more likely that any other individual would. In certain cases, however—for instance, those of infectious disease—the achievement of the good by one individual requires that it should be achieved for others. The good which sanitation achieves must be enjoyed by all the inhabitants of an area if it is to be securely possessed by anyone. Clearly "common good" has more justification in these cases. Some hint of the same meaning lurks in the words "common knowledge," which would normally suggest not only that several people each know the same fact but that communication and not private enterprise led most of them to that knowledge. Yet here again the knowledge or the health is still essentially each man's own health or knowledge. My escape from diphtheria is *my* good, even if in order to achieve it I have to see that others are free from diphtheria also.

(vi) So far there has been no real justification for the association of "common" with "good." The good has been in every case private, and all that was common was machinery or organization used as a means to these ends. Nor has there been any suggestion of a special claim of these individuals as members of the same association as myself. But there remain two usages of "common good" which are more plausible still. The first case is that of loyalty. It seems indubitable that when men co-operate with others to achieve ends through an association, each member of the association faces more interest in the good of his associates than he would in the case of mere fellow-men. A typical if trivial instance may be found in a tennis club. If I wish to play tennis I may play on a private or a municipal court. In these cases I shall feel no special interest in others who use the court nor any duties towards them except negative duties of non-interference. If, however, I join a club to achieve the

same end, I may well find that the club seems to me more than a mere piece of machinery to enable me to play tennis. I find members taking a positive interest in each other, encouraging the weaker players, supporting the club team and being pleased when it wins. My present problem is to decide whether these indubitable psychological phenomena have any moral significance, whether I ever have a moral duty to promote the good of another person because he is a member of the same association as myself, a duty which I should have in a lesser degree, or not at all, to anyone who was not a member. Should "charity begin at home"?

I find it difficult to give a definite answer to this question. Argument seems inapposite and experience equivocal. If I attempt to observe my own decisions I find instances in which the claims of members of my own associations give rise to indubitable duties and others in which their claims have no weight or even a negative weight disturbing the true balance of obligations. If a member of my own college asks me for advice or information, I feel an obligation which would be weaker if he belonged to another college and non-existent if he were a "man in the street." If a fellow of my college is working on a subject in theology or literature and consults me on a philosophical point, I feel I owe him a degree of help which I should not owe to a Cambridge critic or an American theologian. Yet if I am asked to vote for a member of my own college in an academic or political election, I feel a moral obligation to discount such claims. Baffled by such contradictions, I may follow the Aristotelian precept and consult those of my friends for whose judgment I have most respect. I then find that men equally scrupulous and fair-minded give contradictory decisions. Some would try to convince me that fellow-members have an even stronger claim on me than I myself feel, overriding, for instance, my scruples about the case of voting. Others say that charity may begin at home only when it is able thus to be most effective, but that any other recognition of fellow-members is immoral. In the face of these difficulties I incline to believe that membership does give others a special claim on me, and I therefore have to discover some special feature about those cases in which the claim must be neglected. I think in most (if not in all) of these special cases there is a peculiar paramount duty of impartiality (like the duty of a judge *not* to be influenced by the fact that the prisoner is a fellow-Freemason). But I admit that I do not feel that the question whether corporate loyalty is a moral virtue has ever been adequately discussed, and it is obvious that this is a problem of the first importance at a time when conflicting loyalties create the most perplexing problems and when to some men loyalty seems the highest virtue and to others a mere savage superstition.

In our analysis of "the common good," then, I think this is a new case not covered in the previous five senses. Yet even if it is admitted the good is still not itself common or corporate. It is the good of individuals which I promote, though now of these particular individuals in virtue of their membership. The difference here from the previous cases is that the existence of the association and my membership of it are the grounds which make the good of these individuals a claim on me.

(vii) The other category in which "common good" seems more defensible than elsewhere is one in which the good itself at last ceases to be private in its nature and is intrinsically social. There are cases in which the social relationships between individuals are not means or machinery for the production of private goods but are themselves the goods at which we aim. If five men co-operate to help a sixth, he will probably be helped more efficiently, but besides this private advantage to him there comes into being the state of willing co-operation which is intrinsically good. Friendship, mutual trust and confidence, mutual sympathy and understanding, these are not merely institutions useful to the individual in helping him to attain his private ends; they are ends in themselves. It is some recognition of this intrinsic value which is often lacking in attacks on the family, whether modern or Platonic. If you treat the family as an institution instrumental to the production of a good stock (as did Plato) or to the nurture and education of the children (as do some moderns), then you may be tempted to find in sterilization and selective eugenics or in a crèche and kindergarten system some better machinery to serve your ends. But unless you could replace in your new system the close-knit sympathy and understanding of which at its best the family is capable, you will lose something of intrinsic worth. Similarly a school or college is not merely a piece of machinery to enable A, B, and C to teach and X, Y, and Z to learn, but also a device for getting men from A to Z to learn together and live together; and the living together cannot be taught by governesses or correspondence courses, though grammar and geography can. It is a truth even if only half the truth that "education is socialization."

Here we seem to find the strongest case for a "common good." Yet even here we must insert our safeguards. There need in these cases be no society, community, or associations. Wherever A and B trust each other, C and D show mutual sympathy, E and F co-operate, there these goods are realized. So "common good" (if it means good of a community) and "social good" (if it means good of a society) are still phrases with no legitimate application. It may well be that an association, by providing a permanent organized basis for them, may heighten and diversify these good human

relationships which we have just examined, yet even then the association is still only a means to the production of the good, though the good itself has what may fairly be called a "social" character.

My conclusion, then, is that "common good" is always and everywhere a misleading phrase suggesting a unity which is not only non-existent in fact but impossible in principle.

I shall conclude this paper with some illustrations of the dangers which may flow from the misconceptions, examined above, of "society" and the "common good." First we may consider the consequences of transferring either to "society" or to particular associations the characteristics Hegel attributed to the state. One of the most indefensible tendencies of totalitarianism is often thought to be its hostility to freedom in religion, in learning, and in art. But if there were a working World State or League of Nations, its control of religion or learning would be equally unjustified. To move in the opposite direction and confer autonomy on the particular associations would not remove injustice. Everyone knows the danger of trade union tyranny or organized professional tyranny over freedom of religious, political, or intellectual development. No doubt the Miners' Federation and the British Medical Association are useful organizations, but to follow the "Political Pluralists" and to confer on them those characters which Hegel gave the state would perpetuate and would not avoid his most dangerous errors.

It might be supposed from the critical tone of the whole preceding argument that I am returning to the barren individualism of Mill and Spenser and rejecting the discoveries of social psychology concerning group and crowd mentality. But I should not deny that men behave differently in different social groupings and I might even admit that individual psychology is a will o' the wisp—that no one can tell how a man would behave apart from all social relationships. I admit the discoveries and the phenomena. All I question is their interpretation. It is men and not committees who behave. Crowd mentality is not the mentality of crowds but the mentality of men in crowds,[1] as regimental pride is the pride of men in regiments. I can still maintain that social life is natural and political organization desirable. I should also agree that organized associations have characteristics which their individual members have not. They have their own special modes of organization. They have also the character of legal personality. Their ownership of property, their powers of contract, their liability to suit, all these cannot be resolved into characteristics of their members. Yet the vital human qualities—will, desire, and moral responsibility—do not belong to them. Nor in any proper sense have they an interest or a good of their own.

[1] Cf. S. B. Ward in *Mind*, N.S. vol. xxxiii, on "The Crowd and the Herd."

The practical corollaries of these views may be seen if we ask some simple questions. Is it possible for a country to be happy or healthy while all her citizens are diseased or sad? No, for happiness and health can belong only to individual men. Is it possible for a country to have large possessions while all her citizens are poverty-stricken? Yes, for ownership is a legal characteristic which a country may well possess. Could such a country be called prosperous or flourishing? Only ambiguously. Her budget may be balanced, her national debt small, her trade balance favourable, her note issue covered by gold, and her assets large, while every one of her citizens may be driven, perhaps by the confiscation or taxation needed to achieve this national position, to the edge of starvation. Yet economic prosperity is not the only kind of prosperity and, measured in any other terms, "a prosperous country with unprosperous citizens" is a self-contradiction. Is there no danger that men will not see the contradiction because they have been persuaded to endow their country with full personality and to accept sacrifices, which can only add to her wealth and her honour at the cost of damaging the lives of all her inhabitants, as if they were like sacrifices made for a brother or a friend? In the same way a savage may believe that trees and mountains are really persons and the belief may influence his conduct in ways disastrous to all concerned. He may refuse to cross a mountain when his child's life depends on it, or to cut down a tree which will fall on his home to-morrow, so that the spirits should not be offended. So, too, a demand for colonies or a claim to retain them may be made a matter of national prestige or national disgrace, and in the attempt to placate those restless and insatiate spirits, national honour and national pride, children's lives may be destroyed and homes broken up.

Some illustrations of the confusion to which we are all liable may be taken from the correspondence to which I referred at the beginning of this paper. In quoting these I hope it will be clear from the whole of the foregoing argument that I am interested neither to endorse nor to counter the purely historical facts implied in these opinions, but only to see how far they must be restated to be made intelligible and whether in this restatement the original force survives. One writer says that Germany feels the loss of the colonies as an insult because they were taken away from her on the ground that she does not know how to govern natives justly. Another writer repeats the insult and justifies it by evidence. Let us consider, without prejudice, whether the evidence is relevant or the grievance legitimate. The evidence is that a certain African tribe was decimated by the local German governor. The evidence, if true, supports the intended conclusion on the following conditions: (*a*) *either* that the Governor was acting under orders from the German Government *or* that his action was characteristic of all German colonial administra-

tion. (*b*) That there is reason to suppose that the present German Government (or the Governors they would appoint) would be more likely than not to act in this way. Is the grievance legitimate? Why should Germans feel that condemnation of their pre-war colonial administration is an insult to them? Russians do not resent attacks on the penal system of pre-war Russia. The grievance is legitimate only if the colonies are now refused on the same grounds. Another writer in the same controversy dismisses the whole "incompetence" argument as specious. Germany really lost her colonies because she began a war of aggression, lost it, and had to be punished. It is not clear from the letter whether the writer regarded punishment as deterrent or retributive. Let us suppose that he thought it was deterrent. Under what conditions would his argument be valid? (*a*) That the German Government did begin the war in 1914; (*b*) that it was a war of German aggression. It is clear that these conditions are implied. But punishment, whether deterrent or retributive, must fall on the guilty party and so two further conditions are required: (*c*) that those who now suffer from the loss of the colonies were responsible for the war in 1914; (*d*) that other governments will be dissuaded from wars of aggression by the possibility that their successors or the descendants of their subjects will suffer. It seems to me just as clear that the writer was wholly innocent of any misgivings under these last two heads. I do not believe that the notion of punishment can be applied to nations at all. "Sanctions" may stop injustice at the time it is occurring and moral censure may follow on governmental bad faith or brutality, but the necessity for continued responsibility in punishment would make it inapplicable in any ordinary case. Here at least then someone has been misled by personifying a nation.

We are, in fact, in the international field living through an epidemic of "primitive animism." And as animism can be repelled in the end only by the union of a more spiritual religion and morality with a more developed chemistry and biology, so "national animism" still awaits the aid of a change of heart among the worshippers of these false gods assisted by a clearer science of association. We must, however, beware the opposite error. The enemies of primitive animism reacted into an almost equally crude atomistic materialism, treating trees and men as mere aggregates of inanimate particles. So in our hatred of a deified nation we may tend to react into primitive individualism, dissolving away national unity altogether and treating every association as a mere collection of individual men. The organism in biology is a unit; it is neither a cell nor a mere aggregate of cells, neither an atom nor a mere aggregate of atoms. So for sociology the sound view would be that an association has its own characteristic type of unity and is neither a person nor an aggregate of persons.

RESPONSIBILITY, FREEDOM AND DETERMINISM

JOHN BOURKE, M.A., Ph.D.

THERE may in general be said to be two ways in which progress may be made in the understanding and towards the solution of a problem. The one is that of the continual development of it in the form originally given to it, by confirming this and rejecting that point in the light of fresh evidence, by clarification of concepts, and by detecting and resolving ambiguities and inconsistencies. Here it is assumed that the standpoint from which the problem has been approached is relevant and adequate. The other is entered upon when an "impasse" has been reached which can only be avoided by the realization that the original question was asked in a way which was either partially or wholly false or misleading. This is the more radical way of partial or total reformulation of the problem to be solved.

In these few pages I want first to dwell on the traditional form which the twofold problem of Freedom and Determinism appears on the whole to have retained and on the difficulties to which it seems bound to lead; and then to submit a reconsideration, which has not, I think, been sufficiently emphasized, of the nature and scope of the problem at issue.

I wish, however, at the outset to make it clear that the central notion in which I am here interested is that of responsibility and that I shall examine those of freedom and determinism and their interrelation only in so far as the former is understood to secure and the latter to destroy responsibility. It will be well, therefore, to begin by saying something on the meaning of the two terms "freedom" and "determinism" which are themselves by no means free from ambiguity.

I

(*a*) I shall begin with "freedom," assuming for the moment that we know in general what we mean by "determinism." Broadly speaking "freedom" (or its equivalent "liberty") may be said to have been understood by ethical thinkers in three different senses. These three different meanings may be called respectively "capri-

cious freedom," "neutral freedom," and "rational freedom";[1] or perhaps "freedom *from*," "freedom *to*," and "freedom *in*." Our first task is to discuss how far each of these meanings adequately represents that which we understand by freedom when we oppose it to a determining necessity which destroys it.

The first meaning need not detain us long. "Capricious freedom" is simply that "freedom" which a person is said to possess in virtue of which all his actions are sheerly undetermined. It is the "freedom" of chance. The use of inverted commas here is justified, for from the point of view of whether we have here a freedom in respect of which we can choose and are responsible, it may be said to be equivalent to no freedom at all or to strict necessity. Both in the case of strict necessity and in that of "capricious freedom" the self is determined in the sense that its "actions" (if indeed it has any meaning to speak here of "actions" at all) are not within its control. The only difference between the two cases is that in the former the self is determined by laws that are, or, it is believed, can be known, whereas in the latter it is determined by forces which are not, and, it is presumed in the very word "chance," cannot be. Indeed, strict necessity has even been felt to be less incompatible with the notion of responsibility than is that of capricious freedom. Hume in fact, who seems to have understood "liberty" only in this capricious sense, argues for the necessary determination of the will to safeguard morality. "Liberty," he says, "by removing necessity removes all causes, and is the very same thing as chance."[2] But in fact "whatever capricious or irregular actions we may perform, as the desire of showing our liberty is the sole motive of our actions, we can never free ourselves from the bonds of necessity."[3] Accordingly "I . . . dare venture to affirm that the doctrine of necessity, according to my explication if it, is not only innocent, but even advantageous to religion and morality."[4] Capricious freedom may be described as "freedom *from*"; but whether by that is understood a freedom from this or that particular determining cause, or from all determining causes whatever, it is not a freedom in respect of which we could be said to be capable of choosing. Bradley says of it that "you are free, because there is no reason which will account for your particular acts, because no one in the world, not even yourself, can possibly say what you will, or will not, do next." You are "accountable," in short, because you are a wholly "unaccountable" creature.[5] This "freedom" has neither content nor "direction." It

[1] This convenient terminology is borrowed from an acute article by H. Sidgwick on *Freedom in Kant* (*Mind*, 1888, vol. xiii, No. 51, partially reprinted as Appendix to *Methods of Ethics*, 6th Ed.).

[2] *Treatise*, Bk. II, pt. 3, sect. 1, *ad fin.*

[3] *Ibid.*, sect. 2.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ethical Studies*, p. 11.

is clearly not what we mean when we are discussing whether or not freedom is real. Thus when Kant in one place says that "independence on the determining causes of the sensible world . . . is freedom,"[1] i.e. identifies freedom with "independence on" or "freedom from," he speaks inexactly and states less than his own view. This is, of course, and we shall refer to it later, that "although freedom is not a property of the will depending on physical laws, yet it is not for that reason lawless."[2]

I pass to the second and third of the above meanings of freedom, those of "neutral freedom" and "rational freedom." First "neutral freedom." We described this otherwise as freedom *to* do or act. It is neutral in the sense that it is a freedom to express oneself equally in either of two alternative and contrary "directions," e.g. to do either a right or a wrong action, to tell either a truth or a falsehood. The essence of freedom so understood is precisely the capacity, in Aristotelian phraseology, to render actual through choice either of two contrary potentialities.[3] "Rational freedom," on the other hand, may be described as freedom *in*, i.e. in bringing about a result of some particular kind. It is the freedom involved in Kant's notion of autonomy. We are said to manifest it whenever and only when we act rationally and more in proportion as we do so. This, however, involves holding that whenever we fail to act rationally, as for instance when we deliberately do a wrong action or tell a falsehood, we are not acting freely. To this point we shall return later.

I wish now to consider which of these two remaining senses of the term "freedom" most accurately represents that freedom which is the condition of responsibility and with which we are here concerned. When we reflect on them we must, I think, admit that each of them contains a truth which is of great importance in Ethics. On the one hand, when we say of an action which we have done that we were "free" to do it or that we did it freely, or again, that we *chose* to do it, we do certainly mean that we were free to do it only because we were also free not to do it, or to do something else; and again, that we chose to do it only in the sense that we chose it in preference to and as against one or more other possible actions, any one of which we could equally well have chosen. In other words, to be free means to have a "field" *within which* to be free, and to choose means to have alternatives within that field *between which* we choose. On the other hand, it is also true that when we consider a certain action and ask whether it is a free action or ourselves free in doing it, many

[1] *Metaphysic of Morals*, sect. iii (Abbott's translation, p. 87).

[2] *Ibid.* (Abbott, p. 78).

[3] See *Metaphysics* Θ, 2 and 5. Together with *Eth. Nic.* iii, 1–5, these two chapters are very important for an adequate estimation of Aristotle's account of freedom of will.

people will feel it necessary to consider not merely whether we could do or have done any other action, but also what type of action it is that we have done; a mean or immoral action, for instance, will seem to many not to be so "free" as a generous or a noble one nor the agent as free in doing it. This feeling is reflected in ordinary speech in such commonplace expressions as "being the slave of" one's passions or "giving way" to jealousy, and the like. What, however, is not so clear here is whether it is really upon the question of freedom that the important element of truth undoubtedly contained by the second of these two views has the direct bearing that it is asserted to have. Clearly, the "freedom" which we are said to exhibit when we act rationally (or rightly) cannot be the "freedom" which we are said to exhibit in deciding, as we undoubtedly sometimes do, to act irrationally (or wrongly). Either there are two radically different types of freedom, or it is misleading or false to describe one or other of these characteristics as "freedom."

Let us examine this notion of "rational freedom" a little more closely. According to it, whenever we act rationally we are free and more in proportion as we do so. Or, to put it another way, we are free when our will is determined by our reason. This view appears in Kant in such a phrase as that "a free will and a will subject to moral laws are one and the same."[1] But we must notice that it is not enough merely to say that rational freedom means that we are free when we act rationally; for it means more than that. It means that we are free *only* when we act rationally. It is this word "only" that deserves attention. For in restricting, as it does, to the one side, it seems to destroy what is the very nerve of freedom. To say that we are free *only* in doing actions of some one type is to say that we are in fact not free but fettered, at any rate in the sense of being free to choose and responsible for our choice. No doubt it will be objected that in the Kantian notion of autonomy this "restriction" to the one (i.e. the rational) side is imposed by the will itself and does not therefore destroy the will's freedom. In willing the rational or universal, it will be said, the will itself restricts its own sphere of activity; and such a self-imposed restriction, so far from being the negation of freedom, is on the contrary the very essence of freedom and the symbol of a free will. To this point we shall return later. Here we may answer that, while it is true that a rational action, as proceeding from a motive representing our "higher" self, may plausibly be termed a "better" or a "higher" or a "morally more valuable" action, there seems no reason why it should necessarily be a "freer" action than one resulting from a lower motive. To assert that it is leads, as we pointed out above, to the view that we are only responsible for our rational (i.e. right) actions.

[1] *Met. of Morals*, sect. iii (Abbott, p. 79).

The point I wish to emphasize here is this. We may if we like term this character of rationality "freedom." But if the notion of freedom is to stand, as it surely must, in any intelligible relation to those of choice and responsibility, then it is a mistake to think that "freedom" can ever mean anything but "freedom *to*." We must be held responsible, if at all, equally for rational and for irrational, for wrong as for right, actions; and this we can only be if we are equally free *to* do either. Again, we may say, if we like, that the person who consistently wills or chooses rational actions is more "free" than the person who consistently wills or chooses irrational or wrong actions and his actions more "free" than those of the other. But we must bear in mind, if we do so, that we are here introducing a second and totally different conception of freedom which is not that freedom required if we are to be held responsible for any and all of our actions.[1]

I conclude, then, that of these three meanings of the term "freedom," that which accurately represents what we mean when we connect the term with the notions of choice and responsibility is that of "neutral freedom." If choice is not real, then responsibility cannot be real; and without the freedom *to* choose between this or that, choice cannot be real. We may thus define this freedom as "the power of choice between two (or more) possible courses."

(*b*) In the above discussion of freedom we assumed that we knew what we meant by determinism, and understood it to mean a theory in general which denies our power of choice and so our accountability for what comes to be through us. We must now be rather more precise. The term may be and has been understood in at least two main senses. It may mean what we may call "natural" determinism, that is to say, the view that the will is determined "externally" by "natural" forces, whether conceived as physical or as psychological, over which it has no control. This is perhaps the meaning normally assigned to the term when it is contrasted with freedom; but it is not the only possible meaning. The will may also be conceived as determined "internally" by laws of its own. We may distinguish the two cases in another way and say that in both the will is conceived as "determined" but that, whereas in the former case it only "is determined," in the latter it also "determines itself" and only "is determined" because it does so. Now the principles in terms of which the will can determine itself

[1] It may be noted, as Sidgwick points out in the article above mentioned, that it is the collision between these two conceptions of freedom, those of "neutral" and of "rational" freedom, which presents perhaps the greatest difficulty in Kant's doctrine of freedom. He is interested in establishing the reality of both conceptions, but his general principles will not, it seems, admit of it.

could only be rational principles; so that it will not be inappropriate if we call this internal determination "rational" determination and contrast it with the "external" or "natural" determination.

In our discussion on freedom the point about which we wished to become clear was the sense in which the term is to be understood if it is to be connected with responsibility. So here the important question will be the relation between determinism and responsibility, and whether either of the above meanings of the term determinism is more or less compatible or incompatible than the other with the notions of choice and responsibility.

Let us first consider "natural" determinism. Here what we call our "actions" are occurrences which we are instrumental in producing in the sense that we are impelled by this or that sensation or desire conceived as an externally stimulated force which is said to determine the will. Indeed the question seems here to be not so much whether the will is determined as whether there is such a thing as will. Clearly, if "I" am thus regarded as passive in respect of these occurrences, which I fondly call my "actions," brought about through me, then "I" cannot be said to will or choose them. A "passive" will is something very like a contradiction in terms; yet on this view, if there is such a thing as a will, it could at the most be the passive spectator of a series of *faits accomplis*. Such a determinism must annihilate choice and so responsibility as finally and completely as could be desired.

But it is not clear that "rational" determinism is any less incompatible with choice of and responsibility for all our "actions." We have already anticipated this point in examining the notion of "rational freedom." Rational freedom is the freedom said to be exhibited in acting rationally and only in so doing; and the conclusion was suggested that this type of freedom cannot be that required if responsibility is to be real, since it restricts our choice to actions of one kind. The difficulty is not removed by the reply that this restriction itself results from the self-imposition of a law and that it is in this self-imposition that the essence of freedom lies. For no amount of this rational freedom said to be exhibited by the will in imposing a law on itself will account for that exhibited in choosing to disregard the law. The question relevant here is: is there in fact any distinction in this connection between "rational freedom" and "rational determinism"? The freedom of rationality is the freedom of obeying, or in obeying, a (moral) law imposed by the will upon itself. But now the imposition of a law or principle is nothing but a determination, and if the law or principle is imposed by the will on itself, then this is self-determination. I can see no difference in principle between rational freedom and rational self-determination; and Kant himself says that "a free will and a will

subject to moral laws are one and the same."[1] But if we were right in holding that rational freedom is incompatible with responsibility and if further, rational self-determination is synonymous with it, then we must say that what we have called "rational determinism" does not admit of responsibility for all our actions, including our wrong actions.

I wish here not to be misunderstood. I am not putting forward the view that self-determination *as such* is incompatible with responsibility. In fact, in order to escape from "natural" determination, responsibility requires that self-determination in some sense should be real. Nor again do I wish to dispute the view that an action resulting from a rational motive is a morally more valuable action than one resulting from an irrational motive. What I am contending is: (1) that the freedom necessarily presupposed by responsibility is not necessarily connected with rationality, and (2) that I can no more be responsible for all my actions if I am capable of determining myself and my conduct in one way only than I am if I am free only in doing one type of action.

I conclude, then, that natural determinism and rational determinism are alike incompatible with that "freedom *to*" necessitated by responsibility, at first sight for different reasons, but ultimately for the same reason. The apparent difference arises from the fact that, whereas natural determinism removes all possibilities, rational determinism restricts to one. But ultimately, whether you say to a person "you are not free to do either X or Y," or whether you say to him "you are only free when you do X," you are in fact saying the same thing, namely, that in the sense of being free to choose a course for which he can then be held responsible, he is not free at all.

II

We can now pass to our proper subject of discussion. The central issue is, of course, between those who defend the reality of responsibility and of the freedom presupposed by it and those who hold a view which, whether they admit it or not, excludes the reality of either.

The first point perhaps to be noticed here is that the defenders of the reality of freedom have been in the great majority of cases ethical or religious thinkers and that the arguments which have been brought in its defence have been almost invariably based upon ethical considerations. Mr. Carritt, for instance, writes that "freedom of choice seems demanded by morality and only by morality."[2] Freedom, it has been held, must be a reality because

[1] *Met. of Morals*, sect. iii (Abbott, p. 79).

[2] *Theory of Morals*, p. xii.

otherwise we cannot be held responsible for our conduct, and all moral terms and distinctions, such as those between good and bad, praise and blame, lose their meaning. The saint is then a born saint, and the gangster a born gangster, and to praise one and condemn the other is as meaningless as it would be to praise a rainbow and condemn an earthquake. But in fact we do use these terms, we do approve and condemn and people are educated and punished; and this cannot surely be completely without meaning. Again, if moral distinctions are meaningless, a theology founded upon them or in in any way presupposing their validity also becomes meaningless. Further, all such notions as sin and unworthiness, confession, contrition, and conversion, and justification in the sight of God become equally meaningless; for in the sight of God none will then be good or bad, but all will be equal. And this again, it has been widely felt, would be intolerable.

Against the two assertions here implied: (1) that if freedom is an illusion, then moral distinctions are illusory and moral judgments invalid, and (2) that we do in fact make such judgments and employ such distinctions, the determinist would of course have nothing to say. He would readily, or could be made to, assent to both. But he would then go on to insist that moral distinctions and judgments, in so far as they mean to imply that things and persons could have been other than they are, *are* illusory. He would no doubt be inconsistent if he admitted the reality of moral distinctions while denying that of freedom of choice; but there is no inconsistency in rejecting both. This seems to be the position taken up by the two great modern exponents of determinism, Hobbes and Spinoza. The latter, for instance, holds that "men are deceived because they think themselves free, and the sole reason for their thinking so is that they are conscious of their own actions and ignorant of the causes by which those actions are determined. Their idea of liberty, therefore, is this—that they know no cause for their own actions; for as to saying that their actions depend upon their will, these are words to which no idea is attached."[1] Consistently with this view he insists further that terms such as good and bad, praise and blame must, if they are to represent anything in the nature of reality, be divorced from the "moral" meanings which have become attached to them and which are simply the outcome of false and unreal standards of comparison set up by us in our partial and blurred condition of knowledge.[2] Against such a position it is useless to object that the denial of freedom renders moral distinctions unmeaning.

This, I wish to suggest, is the "impasse" out of which there is no way so long as the problem at issue is treated exclusively as an ethical

[1] *Ethic*, Part II, prop. xxxv, Schol.

[2] See especially *Ethic*, Part I, Appendix; and Part IV, Preface.

problem and defended by arguments drawn exclusively from the field of ethics. For the determinist can always reject the presuppositions upon which these are based. I do not deny that it would be in the field of ethics that a determinist account, if tenable, would score its most obvious successes. But I do deny that, if determinism is to be shown to be untenable, such an approach to it is adequate. The problem must be formulated in another way so as to admit of an attack from a different quarter from which escape is not so easy.

Let us now turn for a moment to the philosophy of Kant. In Kant's system and fundamental to it is the distinction between what he calls "theoretical reason" and "practical reason." The former is the source of the principles of knowledge, of what is or may be; the latter is the source of the principles of conduct, of what ought to be, whether it actually is the case anywhere or not. This distinction in itself has relevance here. For, as we have pointed out, the arguments adduced in defence of freedom are for the most part based upon "practical" considerations, while the determinist relies upon a purely "theoretical" and speculative view of the nature of the universe as a whole which he then applies to discredit a certain alleged phenomenon within it; and no doubt such an attempted application of purely theoretical principles to a practical issue would be sufficient to condemn in Kant's eyes any determinist theory as violating one of the central teachings of the Critical philosophy. But there is a further point of greater importance and stricter relevance here. Kant did not merely speak of a "theoretical" and a "practical" reason separate as well as distinct from each other and, as it were, side by side. He also taught that "practical" reason has a "primacy" over the "theoretical."[1] And it is upon this doctrine and its implications that I wish to dwell. For it leads to the thought, which it is the main purpose of this essay to emphasize: that it is a mistake to regard the "practical" as co-extensive with the "ethical," as has all too often been done, and that the "practical" sphere contains in reality far more than what are commonly called "actions."

It seems in fact that the problem of freedom must be approached at a deeper level and on a wider basis than is generally done. For clearly the activity of the will and of choice does not first arise in connection with what the ordinary man would describe as "actions." It is exceedingly difficult to know what constitutes such an "action"; that is to say, in one respect it is not perhaps difficult, for it is not hard to grasp, though it may not be easy to define, what it is that distinguishes an "action" from an "event." But it is extraordinarily difficult to be sure at what point the activity of the self, or if we like, of the will, passes over from being not yet "action" (as commonly

[1] See *Critique of Practical Reason,* Dialectic, chap. ii, sect. iii: "Of the Primacy of Pure Practical Reason in its union with the Speculative Reason."

understood) into being such "action." It is in fact so difficult that we may say that it is impossible; and we may even go further and assert that, so long as we are concerned with the "activity" of the will at all, it is a meaningless undertaking. For the will is precisely that in us in respect of which we are "active," and to be active means presumably to act, and to act is nothing if not to do "actions." What however is commonly understood by an "action" is the taking of such steps by the self as will bring about a change, great or small, in that total set of circumstances which we call the not-self or the "external world." But these external visible and tangible results are themselves willed only derivatively. They are the external, material results of a decision to produce them, and it is this that is directly willed. My concrete stealing of a watch out of someone else's pocket, i.e. the actual material transferring of the watch to my own pocket, may be considered as an action or set of actions of mine, and as such willed by me. But it can only be so considered, and it occurred concretely at all only as a result of a decision of mine to steal it. It is of course true that I may will to steal a watch and yet in the end be physically unable to do so, or be forcibly prevented from doing so; and thus a decision may fail to be followed by what the ordinary man would call an "action." But it is no less true and a great deal more important that I cannot actually steal the watch without having first having willed to do so. In other words, there may be an "act of will" with no resulting "action"; but there can never be an "action" without an antecedent "act of will."

The point that emerges here is, I think, clear. When Kant says that "practical reason" has a primacy over "theoretical reason," he is not uttering some obscure and mystical riddle. He means that, so far from the "theoretical" and the "practical" being distinct and separate, theoretical activity itself, *quā* "activity," involves, as all genuine "activity" must do, a "practical" or active element. Indeed, it is little short of a tautology to say that theoretical activity involves activity. But that in us in respect of which we can be called active is nothing if not the will, and this activity of the will is nothing if not its freedom. Hence it is a great misrepresentation to speak as if the questions of the freedom of the will and of choice arose first in connection with what are commonly called "actions." They do not. They arise in connection with volitional activity as such, and this, as has been pointed out above, expresses itself in decisions and judgments before it issues in "actions." No decision or judgment can be made *in vacuo* and about nothing determinate. When we decide or judge, we accept one course of action or one proposition in favour of and as against another.

Let us now turn to consider the special bearing of this upon the case of the determinist. It is surely plain. The determinist holds a

certain theory, speculative in nature, and based on certain metaphysical or scientific convictions about the nature of the world as a whole. Such a theory, just like every theory, consists of and can be expressed in a set of propositions or judgments. A theory, however, is not something which attaches itself accidentally to the holder of it. It is something in favour of which the holder of it, by maintaining it, actively pronounces as against other possible theories, on the ground that it approximates more nearly than they do to the truth about the world. To hold a theory is to decide in favour of its truth, to claim truth for it. And we are accountable no less for that theory for the truth of which we have decided than we are for that action for which we claim rightness.

It is not open to the determinist to reply here, as he was no doubt entitled to do in the case of the supporting arguments drawn from ethics, that his rejection of moral distinctions discredits this responsibility too. For it is not merely moral distinctions and moral responsibility that are at stake here. What the determinist has here to deny is responsibility *in general* and as such, which will include that incurred by him in his maintaining the determinist theory. And this denial will involve the further one, that it is possible to distinguish between what is true and what is false; for it is only because of a conviction that a certain theory is true that one decides in favour of it. The determinist is in fact here confronted with a dilemma. Either he does accept the responsibility for his theory, or he does not. If he does accept it, then his acceptance invalidates his theory. If on the other hand he does not accept it, then he is not entitled to prefer and put forward his own theory as claiming truth any more than any other, and should strictly keep silence. For then all theories, his own no less or more than any other, are mere mechanical processions of mental events, and as such all no doubt equally actual, but also all equally valuable and valueless.

This seems to be the point that should be stressed. If the determinist insists that arguments based upon moral responsibility and upon moral distinctions are all equally invalid for the purpose of establishing the reality of freedom, we may disagree with him, but we cannot accuse him of inconsistency. If however he goes further and asserts that responsibility in the wider sense of accountability for any decision made is an illusion, he becomes involved in contradiction. He fails to see that the problem of freedom does not possess an exclusive relevance for ethics. As arising first with the activity involved in all decision and judgment, it is an inevitable presupposition of theoretical activity also.

We here reach a point whose further development and discussion would take us too far into the realm of metaphysics and away from

our present subject.[1] It remains now briefly to recapitulate the main points which I have been trying to emphasize and which, it seems to me, should be taken into consideration if we wish to avoid an undue and misleading narrowness in approaching this whole problem.

(1) The freedom which I have been discussing is the freedom which is the condition of choice and the presupposition of responsibility; and the only meaning which I can attribute to the term so understood is that of "freedom *to*." By determinism I understand any theory which, whether by the suppression of all possibilities or (as in the case of the "freedom" of rational determinism) by the suppression of all but one, renders this freedom impossible.

(2) It has too often been attempted to defend the reality of such freedom by arguments drawn exclusively from ethical considerations. Such attempts are bound to fail because determinism can, quite consistently, reject the assumptions upon which these arguments are based.

(3) The reality of this freedom and of responsibility must rather be defended against determinism by showing (*a*) that otherwise the determinist will have to maintain that responsibility as such is not real, and (*b*) that in maintaining the view that it is not real he refutes that view.

There are one or two final remarks which I may add. It is perhaps possible to anticipate at any rate some of the objections which may be raised against the position here outlined. It will be said (1) that though I may perhaps have made it clear that "freedom *in*" is not sufficient to secure responsibility, yet I have not established the reality of that "freedom *to*," which I evidently desire to do; (2) that in dissociating freedom from rationality I have in fact destroyed the possibility of self-determination altogether. I should like to add a few words by way of reply to these points. (1) To this I would say that it has not here been my purpose to develop a detailed and exhaustive argument in defence of the general thesis that "freedom" can strictly never mean anything but "freedom *to*." I have only been concerned to show (*a*) that it is "freedom *to*" which is essential to responsibility, and (*b*) to suggest what is to my mind a more adequate defence than that usually put forward of its reality as against determinism. (2) I have never denied, but rather admitted, that self-determination must in some sense be real if "natural determination" is to be avoided. Nor have I denied that the determining principles which produce right or good actions are, even must be, rational principles. What I have denied is that, if we are to be held responsible for our wrong as well as for our right actions, the freedom necessarily presupposed by such responsibility can be identified with or set in any necessary connection with rationality.

[1] See H. Rickert: *System der Philosophie*, Part I, chap. v, sect. 6.

WILL AND ACTION IN ETHICS (I)[1]

Professor J. L. STOCKS

I

Ethics or Moral Philosophy investigates the application of the terms good and bad. We constantly use these predicates, and Ethics is an inquiry into our use of them. But this pair of terms is used over a very wide field and no one inquiry could cover it all. A ship or a tea or a house may be called good; and the investigation of such judgments would require a knowledge of ships, teas, or houses. Moral philosophy does not pretend to cover the whole field or to investigate every use of the terms: it is concerned only with the moral use, or more explicitly with the use of the terms in reference to human conduct. And even this limitation may not be sufficient. Anything sought or desired by man may be said to be thought good in the moment in which it is sought or desired: we talk sometimes of a good stroke of business: we also speak of good actions, good characters, good men. All these three uses have reference to human conduct; but it may be doubted whether the meaning of good is not different in each use. But there is no doubt that the last is the use with which moral philosophy is chiefly concerned and from which the inquiry must start.

There are two obvious questions which may be asked concerning any predicates, and therefore concerning the predicates good and bad:

(1) What do the terms themselves mean?

(2) To what subjects are they properly applied? i.e. what is the proper subject of the predicate in question?

The first of these questions would naturally be interpreted as a request for a definition. But it is an obvious fact that not all terms are capable of definition. There must be a stopping place somewhere to the process of explaining one term by another. We must be brought in the end to simple unanalysable notions in regard to which the method of definition breaks down. Now philosophy is concerned with these ultimate notions, and therefore definition is of little use to it. We should not be surprised to find that "good," like "being," "beauty," or "truth," is a simple indefinable notion, not

[1] This essay, begun by the late Professor Stocks some time before his sudden death, was never finished. The fragment was apparently the beginning of a book on ethics.

capable of derivation from any more comprehensive notion. It is often questioned whether the method of definition has any great value in other spheres, but in philosophy certainly it has very little. A definition of good (in any sense) is therefore not our aim.

But there are ways of deepening and "precising" our understanding of a term even though it is incapable of definition. We have, of course, to assume that the term is in use and is understood already. But on that assumption it is still possible and may be profitable to ask the second question mentioned above—what is its proper application? This question is not meant to imply that the customary application is wrong—or it would seem to contradict the above assumption. It is in fact necessary to assume that in the main it is right. If the upshot of the philosophical inquiry were to be expressed in such statements as: "This which you call good is bad," "That which you call bad is good," philosophy would simply be giving a rival answer to a question asked and answered well or ill in ordinary life in the course of ordinary practical reflection. But though practical men are by fits and starts philosophers in some degree, philosophy would have no claim to a special place in the world of mind unless it had a question of its own to which it desired an answer. In the sphere of ethics I say that the philosophical question is the one formulated above in the words: "What is the proper subject of the predicates good and bad?"

To ask such a question is necessarily to embark on a *criticism* though not (except incidentally and by accident) upon a *correction* of current applications of the terms. The terms of course are used erroneously. The same thing is called by one man good and by another bad, and each man thinks himself right and the other wrong: they do not think that both may be right. Hence there is actual error in regard to these terms. But even if all uses of the terms were correct and there were no such errors, the philosophic criticism of the terms would still be useful and available. It would take the common attributions as data from which to start, and would sift and test them in the sense that it would attempt to understand them better. It could not find terms simpler than good and bad for the predicates; but it could attempt to discover the general and essential nature of the subjects to which the predicates were applied. Every such attribution is particular (that action was a good one) or at most general (stealing is bad): it might seek for a universal and in finding it would arrive at a clear discrimination of the essential and the accidental in the things called good and bad. It is clear that the more adequate and consistent the customary attributions are the more chance is there that the philosophic question will find an answer, while on the other hand if the ordinary uses are utterly haphazard and confused, the search for an answer to the philosophic

question is a search for a will-o'-the-wisp. In this sense moral philosophy presupposes the substantial rightness of the customary uses of the terms good and bad. But however right ordinary speech is, the philosophic question must humanly remain a separate question which requires a separate answer. Human intelligence does not find universals without taking the trouble to look for them, and it is only so far as the ordinary man, not conscious of being a philosopher, seeks and formulates some kind of universal by the way that he is a philosopher.

The discrimination of the essential and accidental and the effort to find a universal is usually regarded as a work of abstraction. Taken literally that implies that the universal is a part of the particular, a part common to all the particulars which fall under the one universal, and the universal can therefore be formed by removing in thought the other parts of the particular wholes. This gives a simple recipe for finding the universal. Take a number of particulars which are suspected to belong together: analyse their constituents and discover which are constant and which vary from particular to particular: the sum of those which are constant will be the universal, i.e. the universal is the h.c.f. of the particulars. This is highly misleading. Any part of a particular is particular and not universal. The universal is not in that sense in the particulars at all. If the question is asked whether the universal is inside or outside the particulars it is safer to answer outside than inside. For by particular is meant not the thing, but the thing as grasped by perceptual thought, and perceptual thought does not grasp the universal. This shows that it is wrong to think of a universal as a common element in all the many particulars. No part of a particular is universal: the universal is therefore not a part of the particular.

Yet the universal is to be found by abstraction and philosophy is generally described as abstract thought. It is abstract from the point of view of common sense and ordinary experience in which we are all at home: the epithet is earned by the fact that the effort of the philosopher is to remove himself from that point of view and in that experience his results have no currency. "Abstract" is a negative description of philosophy, implying that much is left behind when thought passes to what is not perceived or experienced. The word contains a suggestion of depreciation: the abstract is thin, cold unreal: what is, is concrete. But the philosopher is sure that his is the real world, and sometimes stigmatizes the world of perception as abstract and comparatively unreal. Which then is the real or concrete goodness—the goodness you experience in a friend or the universal which philosophy reveals? The question need not be answered. It is enough to see that philosophy in seeking the universal is seeking something which perception does not find and the per-

ceived does not contain, and that nevertheless it finds its data in the world of perception and is somehow relevant to it.

Philosophy, then, seeks a better understanding of the terms good and bad, not by attempting to define those terms, but by seeking for the universal nature of that of which they are properly predicated. If its procedure is abstract, that word must be taken as only a provisional description, not as committing us to any view of the relative adequacy and inadequacy of philosophy and common sense or of the relative reality and unreality of their objects.

II

What is the proper subject of the predicate good? One and one only said the Stoics, and Kant following them—viz. the good will. The human will, when good, is not the best of many good things: it is the only good thing. The will is good or bad: all other things, without exception, fail to exhibit this distinction—are ἀδιάφορα ("indifferent").

> "Good," says Zeno,[1] "are wisdom, temperance, justice, courage, and everything which is or partakes of virtue. Bad are unwisdom, profligacy, injustice, cowardice, and everything which is or partakes of vice. Indifferent are life and death, repute and disrepute, pain and pleasure, riches and poverty, sickness and health, and the like."

That is, in the sense in which virtue is good and vice bad nothing else is either good or bad. Virtue must be considered an attribute of will, and all Greek philosophers regard wisdom (some with qualifications, some without) as an attribute of will and hence deserving the name virtue. The Greeks not having in their vocabulary a word precisely corresponding to our "will," use as a rule the notion of action instead. Zeno's doctrine confines the application of good and bad to action.

The opening paragraph of Kant's *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals* puts the matter rather differently. He makes distinctions which the Stoics did not make, but on the main point his view is the Stoic view:

> "Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called good without qualification except a good will."

He goes on to mention certain things which are called and are in a sense good, but are not good in this unqualified sense.

> (1) "Talents of the mind" such as intelligence, wit, judgment

[1] Cf. Ritter and Preller, *Historia Philosophiae Graecae*, 516.

(cf. "wisdom," above). "These gifts of nature," he says, "may also become extremely bad and mischievous if the will which is to make use of them, and which therefore constitutes what is called character, is not good."

(2) "Gifts of fortune" such as power, riches, honour, health, happiness. It is the same with these. They "inspire pride and often presumption if there is not a good will to correct the influence of these upon the mind, and with this also to rectify the whole principle of acting and adapt it to its end."

The goodness of which these two classes of things used by the will are capable is utility or usefulness, and in certain cases, when misused, they become unuseful or mischievous. What is unconditionally good cannot become bad.

"Thus," he says, "a good will appears to constitute the indispensable condition even of being worthy of happiness."

He goes on to a third class of conditional goods:

(3) Qualities serviceable to the good will itself, facilitating its action, yet having no intrinsic unconditional value. They are said *always to presuppose a good will.* The instances given are moderation in the affections and passions, self-control, and calm deliberation. These, he says, "are not only good in many respects, but even seem to constitute part of the intrinsic worth of the person." They are not, however, unconditionally good, "though they have been so unconditionally praised by the ancients. For without the principles of a good will, they may become extremely bad; and the coolness of a villain not only makes him far more dangerous, but also directly makes him more abominable in our eyes than he would have been without it."

This third class of conditional goods raises problems which we shall have to deal with later. Kant's words about "the ancients" show that he intends here to criticize the Greek identification of the moral good with virtue. A prima facie contradiction may be noticed in his statement. If these qualities always presuppose a good will, how can they be compatible with a bad will? If they really constitute even in part the intrinsic worth of the person, how can their presence in the bad man make him worse? We may also observe that Kant identifies will with character, and that virtue is commonly regarded as pertaining to character. It is difficult to think of character or action except as marked by whatever of temperance, moderation, calm judgment, and self-control a man may possess. It therefore seems paradoxical to say that will is good or bad unconditionally, while these qualities are not. To these problems we must return:

they are only mentioned here to show the divergence of the two views, which are nevertheless at bottom one and the same.

Essentially the two views are the same, since both assert that the moral good differs not in degree but in kind from other so-called goods. These other things have no right to the name good at all, says the Stoic. Kant says they may have it if some condition or qualification is attached to the term good. That condition is the presence in the man who has or uses them of a good will. Both views deny that the moral good is the best of good things: each says instead that it is the only good. Both views find this good in good conduct, but while one describes the source or principle of such conduct as virtue the other finds it in will.

A thing which is conditionally good fails to be good whenever the condition in question is not satisfied. The same thing therefore may be at one time and under one set of circumstances good and at another time and in other circumstances bad, if the good and bad are conditional. (So Kant argues from the fact that certain good things are also bad that they are only conditionally good.) The unconditional good, on the other hand, is always good. It may be unprofitable to itself or to others, but it is always good. Now there are some philosophies which make moral good, goodness of character or conduct, a conditional good. Good character or conduct, for example, may be said to be that character or conduct which profits its owner or which brings him happiness—or which profits the community and brings it happiness. The conduct is valuable for a result which it brings. It is hard to show that good conduct always is profitable (in either sense) or that profitable conduct is always good—i.e. the current applications of good and bad to conduct do not lend themselves easily to this interpretation. And such a theory really deprives the moral good of all meaning. Good is said to mean useful, and the word useful refers us to that by which the thing is used and the purpose for which it is used. But a man cannot be said to use his will; for to use is to will. Therefore the good will cannot be useful to the agent. Anyhow the notion of profit or utility drives us away from conduct to something else for which conduct is profitable, and we should have to study that and determine its nature before we could discover what conduct is good and what bad.

Plato makes a triple classification of goods: (1) Things good in themselves, (2) things good for their results, (3) things good for both reasons; and hopes to show that "virtue" or "justice" falls in the third class. But when men try to prove that goodness has good results, they usually beg the question. They show not that the conduct which we recognize as good is always good in its results, but that being good it is by that alone proved useful (example, etc.). But the utility of goodness is one thing and goodness of utility

another. Conduct is, in fact, neither good because it is useful nor useful because it is good. Goodness is one thing and utility another, and we must be content to have the two ideas separate. It is best to content yourself with the class of things good in themselves, and avoid special pleading to show that honesty is the best policy.

Anyhow, the view which we have adopted from Kant and the Stoics is the diametrical opposite of any view which attempts to derive goodness from utility. The will is good and it alone is good: it is good in itself, as a picture is beautiful in itself, and not because it lends itself to any purpose or end of its own or any other being's creation. We have now to consider what the good will is and what are the conditions of its realization.

III

In order to understand more clearly the meaning of the assertion that the will alone is good, let us consider some common applications of the word good. A *man* is good, a *character* is good, an *action* is good. But since a man's goodness and goodness of character is shown in action, let us take the last assertion for our starting-point. The assertion that an action is good depends upon a conjectural account of the psychology of the agent, i.e. as we usually say, of the motive of the act, and is reducible to the assertion that the will embodied in the act is good. One man saves another from death by drowning or by other men's violence. Such an act would be presumably called good. But if it were discovered in some way that the man saved was the debtor of his saviour, and that the saviour's only motive was the wish to recover a debt which he could not recover in the event of death, the epithet good would be withdrawn. If again it were discovered that the man saved was the enemy of his saviour and that the saviour had worse things than death in store for him, perhaps the epithet bad would be substituted for that of good. This shows that if action is taken to stand only for the more external side of the transaction—for what is roughly within the reach of observation—actions are neither good nor bad. In the sense in which it is the subject of these predicates action is an activity of the spirit. What is called the motive of the action is either an intrinsic part of the action in this sense or the action itself. It cannot be separated from it. Common language calls actions good and also says that the goodness of an action depends upon its motive: from these two statements we can only conclude that the motive is an element in action, when action is made the subject of moral approbation and disapprobation.

When we talk of the results of an action, on the other hand, we use (or may use) action in a far more external way. For the most

part it is true that the results are the same whatever the spirit in which, or the motive with which, the act is done. When the bullet is once shot, the results are beyond the agent's control. The act is done, its results may be startling and unexpected: anyhow, the agent's intention in shooting will not affect them for good or evil. In this double use of the word action we have the seed of an ambiguity which has given birth to some fallacious arguments. The word must be used cautiously, always remembering that action sometimes includes and sometimes excludes motive: it includes motive when it is the subject of moral predicates and excludes it when considered in the light of its consequences and results.

The contention of those who say that the will and it alone is good and bad is that what is really meant when an action is called good is that an agent's will expressed in action is seen to be good. We have seen that the term "action" is not unambiguous, and that its precise relation to "motive" is obscure. What precisely motive is and how it can be discovered we shall have to discuss later: but if we put will instead of action, we shall get rid of all ambiguity for the moment. What, then, is will? All action is an expression of will, and all will expresses itself in action. The will is the man *qua* active or agent. To act or do is to make some alteration in an existing situation. In order to know what the agent's will was, what you have to know is (1) the situation before action, (2) the situation after action, (3) what the situation before action appeared to him to be. Given complete information on these three points (which is difficult if not impossible to get), you have complete data upon which to judge the moral value of the action, you know what the agent's will was.

It may be objected to the above statement that there is will not expressed in deed and that there is will faultily expressed in deed. Beside the agent's knowledge of existing fact and the actual changes effected by his agency, there is, the critic would say, his will—a third thing, not to be inferred from the other two. It may be that it is the will, conjecturally estimated, which is judged good and bad: but we cannot discover what that will was from what was effected or what was known by the agent, either or both together. A man may have the best will in the world to help and yet find no occasion for helping, and no opportunity for expressing that will in any way whatever. Or instead of helping he may, in the very attempt to help, hinder. So that the will may be either totally unexpressed in deed or totally misrepresented by the deed.

If this criticism were sound, we might ask how will is ever known at all, how we are ever able to pass a moral judgment at all. On any theory, however, it is pretty certain that we are very seldom justified fully by the evidence in our moral praise and blame. And the critic

would reply that in the whole and in the long run the will generally fulfils itself in deed—so that if we wait a little, withholding judgment, we shall discover the truth. That reply gives little handle to criticism.

The true answer to the criticism is one which we can all verify in our own experience—viz. that no man knows what his own will is except from his own acts, and that in inferring his neighbour's will from his neighbour's acts he is doing precisely what he does in his own case. A man may have a conviction, which seems like certainty, that in a given situation he will act in a certain way and every "intention" of so acting, yet when the time comes he may act in precisely the opposite way. The will is not, as we sometimes fancy, made up in advance: it is up to date and no more, and re-adapts itself to each fresh element in the situation as it appears. It is only so far as the situation is (or is thought to be) made up beforehand that the will can be made up beforehand, and the act, as it were, done in advance. The difficulty in inferring another man's will from the effects he is seen to produce is not due to the obscurity of his will—for one's own will is equally obscure and unpredictable—but rather to the difficulty of discovering precisely what he knew.

By a true instinct the criminal lawyers have evolved a principle that the only thing which excuses a man from the penalty of the law is ignorance of the circumstances—one circumstance only excepted—viz. the terms of the law itself. (The exception is necessary because the act is made punishable at law because it is thought bad; it is not bad because it is punishable at law. We are, of course, only dealing with punishable acts which are also morally condemned.) Thus, if the plea of good intentions is to hold good in the criminal courts, it must be reduced to the form of a plea of ignorance of some relevant circumstance or circumstances. Now I believe it to be a fact that "good intentions," when it would be upheld as a valid excuse by a moral judge, can always be reduced to ignorance of this kind. A wife poisons her sick husband. How does she prove her good intentions? By proving that for some reason she was ignorant of the character of the drug she gave, so that she could reasonably expect to assist the cure by the action which, in fact, hastened death. If it could be proved against her that she was blinded by no such ignorance, her plea of good intentions automatically collapses. Thus if we hear of a will not fulfilled in deed or falsified in the deed and wish for more precise information, we should expect to get it in the form of an account of some ignorance or of judgment relevant to the matter in question.

But, you may say, there is another possibility, lack of opportunity. This is not a real possibility unless the will can be made up beforehand. The only real opportunity is in present circumstances, and

such opportunities the will takes according to its lights from moment to moment throughout life. A plan devised beforehand and not relevant to opportunity in this sense is a mere day-dream and has no part in will at all. I may wish to be a member of Parliament, but that wish is only part of my will so far as it is already influencing my action, and it can influence my action only when it is in my power to take steps which will bring the achievement of my ambition —in some degree, however small—nearer. We do not will what is impossible, and lack of opportunity means in the end impossibility. The unrealized will is a day-dream of disappointment—a theory of what we should have willed if circumstances had been different. Such dreams are more and less solid: such theories contain more and less of truth: anyway, there is no way of testing them. They are mere theory, and hardly more likely to be well-founded when they concern oneself than when they concern somebody else.

The objection, then, may be ruled out. The will never expressed in deed is a dream, and the will faultily expressed is a fact misstated. The will always expresses itself, but sometimes through ignorance it alters events in a fashion which it regrets. As we are always insufficiently informed as to the circumstances in which we act—every action being therefore to some extent a leap in the dark —there is plenty of room for excuse and much need of charity of judgment here. "They know not what they do." It is the only excuse for failure, and it is the best rebuke to the pride of success.

IV

It is implied in what has been said that the will cannot be put into words. When it has come into existence (i.e. *after* action) it can be described, like any other individual thing, but like other individuals never completely or exhaustively. Before it exists, too, it can be predicted but only with the insecurity that clings to all predictions even when the prophet is he who knows the possibilities most fully, viz. the agent himself. It is important to remember that an assertion about a man's will is very often a prediction, i.e. a guess: a statement of what he will or would do under certain conditions. When will is used in the present with reference to future contingencies (e.g. will to help) or with reference to a man's state just before action, we are apt to think of the will as a simple proposition or proposal adopted by him: but in so thinking we delude ourselves. What happens is that a man, continually exercising his senses and his intelligence upon his surroundings, reacts continually to the information which senses and intelligence provide, and his reaction is that positive interference with circumstances which we call action. The simplest actions are called by psychologists reactions

or reflexes—e.g. the shutting of the eye when some visible object, say a fly, moves straight upon it—but they are actions, only actions of a simple and inferior type. They are in principle the same as actions of the most developed strategy. They may be called simple and inferior because the element in experience to which they respond is simple and inferior in importance. The power of the developed will is largely that of withholding response to the superficial features of a revealed situation and responding instead to its deeper and more permanent features. The soldier withholds response to the whistle of a bullet by the simple and obvious device of running away, and builds himself bullet-proof fortifications. So as we gain experience of life we learn to disregard little annoyances and disappointments, and to deal instead with the more permanent current of events.

Will, then, is a response to an apprehended situation. We respond inevitably to the whole of what we apprehend. If we have little intelligence and rely chiefly on our senses, like children, what we apprehend is varied, rapidly changing, somewhat fragmentary: the natural consequence is that the actions of children are vivid, changeable, and disjointed. As the intelligence becomes more and more competent to see through the kaleidoscope of sense to the relatively slow-moving strata of experience, action naturally and inevitably becomes more sedate, more precise, methodical and consecutive. It is not unnatural that men who believe that behind the puzzling variety of sense experience is an eternal unchanging reality have been tempted to believe that if men's minds could only reach to that and concentrate their thoughts upon it, their wills, without losing touch with the actual or relevance to its demands, might acquire a like constancy and immutability—so that their action, while preserving like the world an appearance of change and variety, might express a will which was always the same. Such a knowledge would be like the sight of the Pole-star which, being alone unmoved relatively to the earth, is a safe guide to the way over the earth. Without either adopting or criticizing such a theory, we may take it as an expression of the inevitable and easily verified relation of thought in all its varieties to action. The function of sense and thought is not (primarily, at any rate) to forecast the unknown future or resuscitate the dead past, it is to give us information as to the actual present situation in which we find ourselves, and upon that information we act. The philosophers who believe, like Plato, in the knowledge of the eternal as the only safe guide in life do not promise us that we shall be able to deduce from such a knowledge by any intellectual process a sovereign plan for unravelling all practical difficulties or that we shall be able in virtue of that knowledge to predict the future. The world, they say, is eternal; we shall know the world; and to that knowledge our action will be inevitably

responsive. Our will also will be in a sense not temporal but eternal, by the same law which governs the simplest sense-reflexes of a child or an animal.

Will, then, is a reaction to a situation as apprehended, and consequently power to apprehend what is, is of the greatest moment to it. In such a reaction let us consider what place should be allotted to the notion of motive, a notion on which our moral judgments are often said to turn. Motives may be said in general to be named after a result which an action is intended to produce. ("Intended" is perhaps obscure since intention has not yet been discussed.) The reference to a result is sometimes direct, as when we say "his motive was the desire to help a friend," sometimes indirect, as when we talk of motives of economy, avarice, etc. In these last two cases the sparing and hoarding of money are easily specified as the "ends" or results-to-be-produced in question. Sometimes, e.g. when we speak of motives of affection or resentment, the reference is as much backward into the past as forward into the future. Generally any desire, affection, emotion, or propensity may be alleged as motive; and it is fairly obvious that the desire or emotion specified is intended to account for and corresponds to the direction or tendency of the action, i.e. of the intended interference with circumstances. Sometimes quite nakedly as in the first case ("desire to help") the attribution of a motive consists simply in alleging in the agent a more or less constant tendency to move in the general direction instanced in the act. But in the end this is always the meaning of motives. They are something in the man rather more permanent than the individual will and on the other hand rather less permanent than the individual character which finds expression at a particular moment in a particular action.

Now if will is a man's power to react to circumstances by altering them and motive is a disposition to alter them in a certain direction, motive is will and will is motive. The only difficulty in such an identification is that the will has hitherto been considered as an individual manifestation in a single act while the motive appears to be something more general—so we might regard the will as the motive individualized in the particular situation and the motive as the will generalized into a constant tendency. But consider the facts rather more closely. What do we mean by the "direction" of an action? All actions are necessarily selective: one thing only can be done at a time: always certain elements in the complex whole which we call the situation are altered in preference to others equally alterable. Such dispositions or desires as have been mentioned would betray themselves in this business of *selection*. In virtue of avarice, e.g. a man would be ready to alter any circumstance which obstructed access to money and reluctant to alter any circumstance

which served as a protection to his hoarded wealth. Similarly in virtue of cowardice a man would be reluctant to alter any fact which safeguarded his person and ready to alter any that endangered it. But antecedent to selection is the observation which discovers what the situation is, and in regard to *observation* also the dispositions and desires would play their part. An avaricious man would perceive quickly any factor advantageous or disadvantageous to his special interest of hoarding and a coward would notice immediately the factors which made for and against safety. In the same way a selfish man shows his selfishness not merely in not acting so as to help others, but also constantly in not observing the effects which his action has upon the interests of his associates: he tends to ignore that element in the situation altogether and to see only what directly concerns himself.

Now the field of will is necessarily limited by the field of observation. Much of what is observed is in a greater or less degree irrelevant to the response in action; but it is quite certain that will or action cannot be a response (even if it is accidentally relevant) to what is not observed. (Accidental relevance is what we call a fluke.) The relation of observation to will is complicated by the fact above noticed that will (in the form of desire) to some extent determines our selective observation: but, confining ourselves for the moment to the single act, we may say that the limits of observation determine the limits within which will operates. A statesmanlike view of things is a necessary precondition of statesmanlike action, and narrow or one-sided observation creates a like character in a man's conduct.

It follows from all this that when we attribute a motive to action we implicitly assert an unverifiable hypothesis that a certain factor in the situation was especially prominent in the eye of the agent taking stock of his position before action, and that, of the multitude of consequences that any alteration has, one set of consequences was specially in his mind. The hypothesis is clearly unverifiable because we cannot get inside his mind and see what he saw, and even if we saw what he saw we should still have doubts because of the multitude of irrelevant detail which must cloud even the narrowest and most specialized observation. If a man acts so as at the same time to benefit both himself and a friend, who shall say that the one or the other consequence preponderated? There is no reason why he should know himself; but, of course, he may know since the one profit or the other may have been entirely unforeseen or even the opposite of what he expected. The important thing is that the attribution of motive seems to involve, at least in the instances given, the theory of a one-sidedness in the judgment of the agent and consequently in his action; and, since such a limitation seems to be a defect in practical wisdom, it looks as if the good will would

be altogether free from motive in this sense—good action would be unmotived action.

In short, motive is a desire which limits observation and through observation limits action. But such limitation cannot be a good thing. Therefore the good will must be free from such desires. This argument is probably sound in the main, but it will perhaps need some qualification before it can be finally accepted. (But there may be good or useful prejudices as well as bad, and to be without prejudices (in this sense) means that you are overwhelmed by the press of detail. Selection, however risky, is a practical necessity.)[1]

[1] This sentence appears as a pencilled parenthesis at the bottom of the manuscript page.

(*To be continued*)

THE ALLEGED FASCISM OF PLATO

H. B. ACTON, M.A., D.Phil.

I

In Germany the claim is sometimes made that National Socialism incorporates the best of Plato's political theory. In this country, too, Bertrand Russell and Mr. R. H. Crossman have emphasized, but with a different intention, the fascist elements in Plato's thought. It has to be admitted that whereas it would be merely laughable to claim that Jesus or Kant were exponents of the fascist philosophy, there is no such glaring incongruity with regard to Plato. It may be of some interest, therefore, to examine anew the alleged likeness between the basic principles of fascism and the thought of Plato. No one would deny a strong likeness between some details of Plato's teaching and some details of fascism. The question is whether these likenesses are mainly accidental, or are due to some deep-seated similarity of outlook. In order to make this comparison, a fairly full account of fascist philosophy is needed. For since the word "fascism" is now highly charged with emotion, it tends to be used as an epithet of praise or disfavour rather than as a precise designation. Because not all fascist systems are in complete agreement, my account of fascism will be composite.

Perhaps the most fundamental characteristic of fascism is its "revolt against reason." Fascists themselves, in so far as they are aware of their intellectual position, would admit their opposition to "rationalism." This is a point of view which it is important to understand. The eighteenth century saw the spread of a movement of thought which is known as "the Enlightenment." According to the thinkers of this movement, there were certain ends which it was rational for men to pursue, and which men would pursue if they were not distracted by prejudice or blinded by ignorance. These ends were basically only one end, variously designated happiness or pleasure. It was held to be the business of the political theorist to show how happiness could be best achieved. Various well-established institutions were condemned because they failed to contribute to the general happiness. The fact that an institution had long existed was no argument in its favour. An hereditary aristocracy, for example, was condemned on the ground that the general happiness was best promoted by putting government in the hands of those best fitted to govern, and of those who would be forced to govern

as the citizens wished. Impelled by patriotic and religious "enthusiasms," it was said, people tend to act against their best interests. If only they will free themselves from outworn traditions and misleading superstitions, they will be able to apply an unprejudiced intellect to the solution of their political problems. With the removal of prejudice men will come to agree on what is best in political action. For there *is* a best, which intelligent and fair-minded men will agree on. The appeal to prejudice breeds conflict, the appeal to reason leads to profitable agreement. Looking back over the history of the Western world, the philosophers of the Enlightenment claimed to see a gradual reduction of superstition and a weakening of prejudice; the power of kings, priests, and nobles was diminishing, while that of enlightened philosophers was increasing. In history could be descried a progress which, with the advance of science and spread of education, would be accelerated. Oppression, war, ignorance, and even poverty would be increasingly eliminated. History had an intelligible plan.

Beliefs of this kind have had an enormous influence upon our present civilization. Fascism completely repudiates them. Happiness is regarded as an unworthy end; utilitarianism, according to Signor Mussolini, is a *low* moral creed. Calculating attempts to increase happiness or reduce pain are undignified. Humanitarians are materialists who think that the dignity of man is enhanced by his release from effort and pain. The social worker, and even the physician, often presuppose this false morality according to which personal satisfaction is the highest good. This moral protest is supported by an appeal to biology. An increase of comfort will deteriorate the human race. Spengler says:

> Nineteenth-century medicine, a true product of Rationalism, is . . . a phenomenon of age. It prolongs each life whether this is desirable or not. It prolongs even death. It replaces the number of children by the number of greybeards. It promotes the world outlook of *panem et circenses* by estimating the value of life by the number of its days, not by their usefulness. It prevents the natural process of selection and thereby accentuates the decay of the race.—*The Hour of Decision*, p. 223.

The philosophers of the Enlightenment had supposed that men really agreed upon their valuations; what looked like radically opposed systems of values were the results of hampering traditions; if only men would free themselves from them they would acknowledge the same ends. This is denied by the fascist. Separate groups develop different cultures and moralities. There is no means of deciding between them by argument. The best culture or civilization is that which survives. Hence the only way to prove that your way of life is better than that of another people is to impose it upon

them. Furthermore, what is generally taken to be argument on moral questions is not argument at all. When a man claims to prove by argument that a certain way of life is the best, he is really only inventing excuses for his own conduct; his code of morality is not a result of argument but of circumstance. People invent reasons for supporting codes which they would have supported even if they had no reasons at all. Hence there is no difference between prejudices and so-called "enlightened" beliefs. Reason is just another prejudice.

Again, the fascist holds that there is no plan in history; or if there is a plan there is no progress. History is just a struggle of groups, individuals, cultures, and civilizations. Those that survive are the best, but we can only see which is best by seeing which survives. Hence there is no progress, for progress implies an objective standard in accordance with which individuals or groups are judged and to which they approximate more and more. History is a battlefield where disparate groups and civilizations grow and decline, conquer or meet disaster. Chance plays a great part in the issue. In the course of history man has not changed. He is no more free now than he was five thousand years ago. He is no less superstitious, religious, or prejudiced. Most men have always preferred the safety of obedience to the responsibilities of freedom. The modern man calls his god "Progress." Where his forefather spoke about devils the modern man speaks about germs.

So much for the general world-outlook of fascism. We now turn to its political teaching. Here, of course, nationalism is the most important ingredient. Because there are no objective rational ends upon which all unprejudiced men would agree, it follows, the fascist insinuates, that there is nothing left for the individual but to promote the values and power of his own group. This contention gains force because, for a variety of reasons, it has happened that in the twentieth century there has been a great deal of controversy in the sphere of morals. Within a single national community different groups have adopted and advocated very different moral valuations. People have differed very widely as to the morality of war. Moral problems associated with property have elicited opposing answers. There has been much disagreement and change in sexual morality. Democratic States purposely allow these controversies, believing that tolerance and experiment are better than persecution and rigidity. But a great many individuals are puzzled and alarmed by this uncertainty. They like to know exactly where they stand. The experimenters and reformers force them to reflect on matters which they would prefer not to think about. Why must we begin to alter ways which we have become accustomed to? The fascists take advantage of this uncertainty and resentment. They demand that

controversy on fundamental moral questions shall cease. Dissident minorities shall be coerced and a single code shall apply to the whole nation. People will once again know exactly where they stand. All moral problems will be solved by a single simple formula: "Private and group interests are to be subordinated to the good of the Nation." A scrutiny of moral precepts in the light of any other principle than this becomes treason. Hence in Italy the priesthood is given great power in education. In Germany projects for humanizing the penal code are discontinued. In both countries attempts are made to reinstate the old sexual morality by making women as dependent upon men as can be. These tendencies meet with the approval of all those who are materially and spiritually injured by moral change. Men are no longer men, but Germans, Italians, and "Britons" (not Englishmen, Welshmen, or Scotsmen).

Now the most spectacular way of promoting the "good" of a nation is to increase its power *vis-à-vis* the power of other nations. Hence the eyes of the population are concentrated upon the doings of the nation in the international arena. The principle is actually enunciated that home politics are subordinate to foreign politics, that a diplomatic or military victory is more important than an increase in social welfare. Spengler says :

> Internal politics exist only to secure the strength and unity of external politics, and when they pursue different aims of their own, decay sets in and the State gets "out of form."—*The Hour of Decision*, p. 35.

A single rigid morality is established internally in order that a united nation shall be able to increase its power. Intolerance at home is combined with belligerency abroad.

Another important characteristic of political fascism is "the leadership principle." There can be no reconciliation between fascism and democracy. The following are the main complaints made by fascists against democracy: (i) Democratic government must be weak government. For decisions in democracies are generally the result of compromise. Furthermore, owing to the party conflict the work of one government can always be undone by the government which succeeds it. (ii) The growth of parties splits the community. The tendency is for individuals to put party before the community as a whole. (iii) Democratic government enables responsibility to be avoided. Governments refrain from carrying out unpopular but necessary measures. Rather than do so, they resign and thus attempt to throw the unpopularity upon the next government. (iv) Democrats are "soft." They generally fear to make use of that force without which all government is impossible. Hence democratic governments can easily be swept away by those who can and will use force. As a result

of these criticisms fascists propose to abolish parties (except their own), to eliminate their political opponents, and to submit themselves to the leadership of a single man who is ready to take the responsibility of governing. A single leader appeals to the masses more than a committee does. It is easier to be loyal to an individual than to a set of principles. A leader cannot resign when things go wrong and throw the task of improvement upon other people. When people say "The correct policy is what the leader says is the correct policy," they will act together with the minimum of friction.

Hence we have two fundamental propositions in fascism. First the nationalist proposition: "Whatever is for the good of the nation is right." Then the leadership proposition: "Whatever the Leader says is good for the nation is good for the nation." The Leader's opinion is, therefore, the criterion of right and wrong.

There are two important corollaries of these general principles. Fascists tend to lay great stress upon myths. They say that large bodies of men can only act together with enthusiasm when they believe the same stories. These stories may or may not be true. The important fact is that they are believed in, not that they are true. In order that a nation may be highly organized the masses must be taught the same myths. Herr Hitler was deeply impressed by the Allied war-time propaganda. He thought that the Allied success in the Great War was largely due to their widespread belief that they were fighting for justice and democracy (*Mein Kampf*, vol. i, ch. 6). The Central Powers never evolved such an attractive myth; the Allied propaganda was so skilful that it even affected the Germans to some extent. Since the war the National Socialists have invented some extremely popular and effective myths in order to heighten the national self-respect. These, and the coresponding myths of Italian fascism, need not be recapitulated here. Signor Mussolini acknowledges the influence of Sorel in showing him the importance of political mythology.

The second corollary concerns the nature of the fascist moral code. The fascists repudiate a utilitarian moral code. *A fortiori* they repudiate a moral code of love and forbearance, such as that sketched out in the Sermon on the Mount. Such codes, they say, are unbiological. Furthermore, they are incompatible with nationalism. In their place fascism substitutes a code of *honour*. In this code the highest place is given to what might be called the military virtues. A high value is set upon bravery, endurance, loyalty, unquestioning obedience to superiors, quickness to resent an insult. Pity for the weak is, as Nietzsche had argued, opposed to the lessons of biology, for action prompted by pity tends to preserve and perpetuate the weak. If the strong rejoice in their strength they will by exterminating the weak improve the race. It is also held that a large part of the

morality of neighbour-love is merely hypocritical. This aspect of the fascist teaching is too well known to need quotations.

II

Now it is immediatley apparent that the irrationalism and the relativism which are fundamental to the fascist outlook are wholly lacking from Plato's thought. According to him the Good is discoverable by the intelligence, and is hence the same for all rational beings. There can be little doubt, I think, that if he had been presented with the conception of separate cultures possessing diverse sets of valuations between which no rational preference was possible, Plato would have repudiated it. That he would have done so is clear from his attitude towards those Sophists who adopted a somewhat similar position. So far as I understand him he believed in fixed, intelligible values which are, in the long run, aspects of one. The Good is revealed to intelligence. Hence, although not all men are intelligent enough to apprehend it, different groups and societies will have the same good. There will be an objective standard in terms of which societies may be compared. It is important to notice that such a view, like that advanced by the philosophers of the Enlightenment, is opposed to the extremest forms of nationalism. For when it is held that the good is open to intelligent inquiry and that the standards of a restricted group are not the only standards available for its members, the individual is no longer faced with the choice between immorality and isolation on the one hand and selfless absorption in the national ethos on the other. But this is the choice into which the fascist leaders endeavour to thrust the individual to-day. Faced with this choice he will generally elect for conformity and nationalism. Only those are proof against this dilemma who possess a morality which is universal in its claims.

Another instance of Plato's fundamental aversion from modes of thought associated with fascism may be seen in his attitude towards war. As is well known, Signor Mussolini has several times publicly extolled the grandeur of war; Spengler, in a passage which I have quoted, says that external policy is more important than internal policy; to General Ludendorff is due the aphorism that policy exists for the sake of war, not war for the sake of policy. Now this very problem was discussed by Plato in the first book of the *Laws*. In that book the constitutions of Crete and Sparta are criticized because they were manifestly designed with efficiency in war as the supreme end. The following passage shows the conclusion which Plato reached:

> But the best is neither war nor faction—they are things we should pray to be spared from—but peace and mutual good will. And thus a victory of a

city over itself turns out, it would seem, to be not so much a good as a necessary evil. It is as though one fancied that a diseased body which has been subjected to medical purgation were at its best in that condition, and ignored a body which has never stood in need of such treatment. So, if a man takes a similar view of the happiness of the city, or indeed of the individual man—I mean, if external wars are the first and only object of his regard—he will never be a true statesman, nor will any man be a finished legislator, unless he legislates for war as a means to peace rather than for peace as a means to war.—*Laws*, bk. i, 628. A. E. Taylor's translation.

It is clear, of course, from this passage, and others in the *Republic*, that Plato was far from being a pacifist. This, considering the conditions of his era, is not to be wondered at. Furthermore, *reasoned* pacifism, as it exists to-day, is born of the terrible fragility of our highly specialized society, and the alarming efficiency of modern weapons. *Religious* pacifism depends upon a scale of values which has only become accepted at all as a result of the spread of the Gospels. The values to which the religious pacifists appeal are repudiated by fascists, Christians, communists and average men. It is, therefore, no sign of fascism in Plato that he, too, did not acknowledge them. Passages can be quoted, it is true, in which he asserts that the Greeks were innately superior to barbarians and not bound to observe civilized rules of war with them. But we are hardly justified in regarding such passages as examples of racialism or nationalism. They are not the conscious expressions of a *Weltanschauung*. They are just prejudices, like his prejudice against manual workers.

It is worth digressing at this point to call attention to the significance of this difference. There has always been class and group prejudice. What, then, is the difference between fascist nationalism and sheer national prejudice? The sociologist Karl Mannheim has shown how such a question has to be answered. An unchallenged prejudice is very seldom uttered. Conservatives are traditionally called "the stupid party," because they are not responsible for as many books as the other parties are. But the reason why they do not write and argue is not that they are stupid, but that they are satisfied. If they felt threatened they would defend themselves, intellectually and physically. Similarly, I think, the fact that fascist nationalism now attempts to construct a philosophy is a sure sign of the criticism and dislike which nationalism has aroused. Those who, for some reason or other, wish for the perpetuation of nationalism, have felt it necessary to defend themselves.

We have seen that there is lacking in Plato the fundamental irrationalism of the fascists. But in his attitude towards government and democracy he has much in common with them. Plato held that in any well-ordered State an hierarchical organization was inevitable. He held that the average man is not fit for political responsibility and cannot be educated for it. He held that government should be

carried out by specially trained experts who would consult, not the people's wishes, but the people's good. He held that the activities of business men should be subject to State control. Exaggerated humanitarianism, he thought, would lead to the perpetuation of unhealthy stocks. Democracy he believed to be a form of government which was bound to give place to tyranny. Tyranny itself he criticized as an inefficient and wicked form of authoritarian government. But he did not disapprove of authoritarian government itself. He was prepared to welcome a rigid censorship of art and morals. He advocated the teaching of social and political myths which the rulers themselves did not believe in. He believed in the need for a State religion with the punishment of heretics. In the *Laws* he went so far as to suggest the establishment of a body like the Inquisition for the punishment and eradication of heresy (bk. x, 908-909).

There is no need for me to give a detailed account of Plato's views on government. But for the purposes of this paper it is important to say something about his description of democracy in the *Republic*. For this description is of great sociological importance. The following passage repays careful examination:

> "Then, first and foremost, they are free, the city is crammed with liberty and freedom of speech, and there is permission to do there whatever anyone desires?"
>
> "So they say," he said.
>
> "Then clearly where the permissive principle rules, each man will arrange his own life to suit himself?"
>
> "Clearly."
>
> "Then this constitution, I fancy, will be distinguished by the wonderful variety of men in it?"
>
> "Surely."
>
> "It will turn out to be the fairest of constitutions," I said. "Like a garment of many colours of every shade and variety, this constitution will be variegated with every character, and be most fair to look upon; and possibly, just as children and women admire many coloured things, so many people will judge this city to be fairest of all."—*Rep.* VIII, 557. A. D. Lindsay's translation.

The democratic man, Plato goes on, argues that the only way to cope with a desire is to satisfy it; hence all desires, he says, "are alike and deserving of equal honour." We might say that the democratic man recognizes a democracy of desires; every desire is to count for one. He endeavours to embrace within his one life as many kinds of experiences as he can.

It was Plato's opinion that this sort of democracy contained within itself the seeds of tyranny. There is insufficient provision for electing efficient men to offices of importance. Hence the technique of governing deteriorates. Professional politicians arise who get popular support by promising to plunder the rich; the larger proportion of

the plunder, however, they appropriate to themselves as their due rake-off. The laws themselves are not strictly executed and so fall into disrepute. There is a tendency to be lenient to criminals. The tyrant arises as a popular leader who organizes a bodyguard to protect himself against lawless opponents. With the help of the bodyguard he seizes supreme power. To begin with, he adopts popular, radical measures. In order to remain in power, however, he has to make himself indispensable. Hence he engages in wars. War serves also to keep his opponents from conspiring against him, because they have to work so hard to finance the war that they have no time for political agitation. But differences inevitably arise among his own supporters. In order to maintain his supremacy the tyrant has to suppress the ablest and bravest among them. The word which Plato uses for this process is "purge." Thus the tyrant comes to be surrounded by worthless creatures and is compelled to govern by sheer force which is only available to him for as long as he can pay for it.

There are a number of points of considerable interest in this analysis. In the first place, Plato emphasizes the variety of characters which arise in a democracy. This is a tendency which democrats have welcomed. John Stuart Mill, for instance, not only argued in favour of liberty of opinion, but he also urged the necessity of "experiments of living." It cannot be denied that "experiments of living" may have great social value. Moral codes which succeed fairly well in one set of circumstances may be totally unable to cope with changed conditions. If, however, the modes of social life are so stereotyped that no one dare live his life to a new pattern, the society may not be adaptable enough to survive in the changed conditions. Again, some would argue that spontaneous conduct is intrinsically superior to regulated or traditional conduct. But however important these considerations may be, it must also be remembered that there are limits to the tolerance which any society can permit. These limits are set by the social disturbances which the tolerance evokes. Societies exist because people have to live together and like to live in certain fixed ways. People want to live their own lives, it is true; but most of them can only think of living lives like their fellows. And they also want security. When tolerance threatens to interfere with security democracies are faced with great danger. Tolerance is valuable in so far as it preserves peace and mitigates institutional rigidity. But tolerance may, in some situations, actually promote disorder and endanger institutions. Democracies have often failed to recognize this.

Plato, it will be remembered, says that the democrat admits a democracy of desires. Satisfaction is to be sought, irrespective of what is to be satisfied. It is true that in democratic societies there is a

tendency to regard extremely divergent moral codes with tolerance. Historically this is a legacy of the Enlightenment. The early defenders of tolerance argued that society gained more than it lost by allowing people to worship how they pleased. This is still the case in our society. In the Western world, at any rate, people's religious beliefs do not affect their conduct very much, and so governments can afford to neglect them. But people's moral and political beliefs have a greater influence upon their conduct. Hence the tolerance which is practicable with regard to religion may not be practicable with regard to morals and politics. Religious tolerance is closely correlated with lack of religious belief. Similarly a complete moral tolerance is incompatible with the adoption of a moral attitude. An era of moral tolerance, therefore, is likely to be an era when a moral code is undergoing, or is about to undergo, great changes. Such an era cannot be permanent. Those who live in it have the task of establishing a generally acceptable and efficacious morality.

Fascists, I have said, tend to deny the view that history shows a single plan emerging in the general improvement of mankind. Plato's suggestion, towards the end of the *Republic*, is that even if a well-ordered community is established, it will tend to deteriorate.

> . . . but since decay is the lot of everything that has come into being, even this constitution will not abide for ever, but will be dissolved.—VIII, 546.

And he goes on to describe the likely course of degradation from kingship to tyranny. Among the Greeks there was, of course, nothing like the modern belief in Progress. That the historical process was cyclical was held by Heracleitus, and later, with much subtle illustrative detail, by Polybius. This theory of an historical cycle was taken over by modern critics of democracy. It is well known that Nietzsche, from whom Spengler borrowed much of his philosophy, believed in an "eternal recurrence;" the events that are happening now have happened before an infinite number of times, and will happen again an infinite number of times. Spengler has argued that although every civilization is separate from every other, they all run through the same inevitable stages of birth, rise and decline. Pareto held that there must be a continual oscillation between conservative and radical groups. It is interesting to inquire why fascists should now find such speculations so attractive. There is no space to enter thoroughly into this inquiry, but there is one obvious point which ought to be emphasized. The denial of progress and the substitution of the theory of recurrence acts as a discouragement to reformers and utopians. They must put before themselves a picture of the society which they are endeavouring to realize, and they are heartened in their efforts if they think that these efforts are being made in the line of a prevailing tendency. If they come to think,

however, that there is no such prevailing tendency, and that men never achieve anything permanently, but always slip back into their original barbarism, then they are likely to conclude that the effort of reform is not worth the making. The humanitarian is generally tender-minded. He will be paralysed into inaction by the vision of historical recurrence.

LAWS AND THEORIES

NORMAN CAMPBELL, Sc.D., F.Inst.P.

Is there any important distinction between a law and a theory? Some usages suggest that there is. Thus, everyone speaks of Boyle's Law (not theory) and of the dynamical theory (not law or laws) of gases. But the most summary inquiry will show that the distinction is not maintained consistently by individual authors, still less as between different authors; the terms "Newtonian law" and "theory of gravitation" seem to be used indifferently to denote the same proposition(s).

The practising physicist would certainly admit a distinction. Roughly, he would say, laws result directly from experiment; theories are tested by means of laws, but they contain an element, in virtue of which they explain laws, that is not so directly associated with experiment. The distinction is of great practical importance, because physicists are rapidly segregating into two classes; one establishes laws in the laboratory, the other explains or predicts them in the study. But the line of division is not easily drawn. Why bother about it? When the distinction is important, it is obvious; when it is not obvious, it cannot be important.

Philosophers, who consider the wider implications of science, are usually much less definite. Most of them seem to ignore the distinction; and those who clearly admit it (possibly not under the same nomenclature) differ curiously about its nature. Some (e.g. Mill) regard theories as hypotheses, doubtful propositions which may in time require the dignity of established laws; others (e.g. Eddington) regard theories as embodying the full refined scientific truth, and laws as secondary means leading to that truth. Surely this uncertainty is discreditable. If all scientific truth is of one kind, why does the distinction made by the practising scientist persist and increase ? If it is not all of one kind, then a discussion of the meaning and validity of science must start with the making of a distinction between the two kinds.

I have long believed that the making of this distinction is much more than a preliminary to a philosophy of science, and that when it is made some of the major problems of that study are already solved. That opinion is expounded in my *Physics: The Elements* (1920). It has received very little attention; the reason may be that it has been considered and found wanting; but it may also be that, owing to the great length of that book, it has never been considered at all. The

developments of science since it was written, and the discussions to which they have given rise, appear to make it more necessary than ever to analyse science so as to make the distinction clear. The purpose of this paper is to give the briefest possible outline of the analysis previously offered.

Science is based on facts. Statements of fact are offers to demonstrate an experiment. Thus it is a fact that a particular numeral indicated by the pointer on a scale of a particular voltmeter connected across a particular resistor is associated with a particular numeral similarly indicated on a particular ammeter in series with that resistor. A statement of that fact is, in effect, a challenge to anyone, who cares to come and see the experiment carried out, to show by his actions (not only by his words) that his experience is *not* the same as mine. Science is possible because such challenges can be made and cannot be successfully resisted; there are certain experiences in which men (and animals) cannot really differ, however much they try. Such experiences are the raw material of science.

A law is a collection of an indefinite number of statements of fact, all of which are in some sense equivalent. Thus Ohm's Law is a collection of all the statements of fact equivalent to the foregoing. In all the equivalent statements some numeral indicates the potential difference across a resistor and some other numeral associated with it indicates the current through the resistor. The statements are equivalent because they are two other series of experiments, described by statements of fact, one of which establishes the "existence" of currents, the other the "existence" of potential differences. In the first series it will be shown (e.g.) that a certain magnetic field, a certain rate of heating of a resistor, and a certain rate of deposition of silver on an electrolytic cathode are all associated; in the second it will be shown (e.g.) that a certain rate of heating is associated with a certain force between parallel plates. It is these other experiments, not equivalent to the experiment from which we started, which give meaning to the terms that are employed in "generalizing" statements of fact so that they become laws.

Further—and this is most important—the equivalence is the main reason why I am prepared to make the original statement of fact. If I doubted that the ammeter "really" indicated currents and the voltmeter voltages—if in common parlance I doubted that they were in proper working order—I should be far less willing to make my challenge to demonstrate to the world to-morrow what I have observed to-day.

This very brief analysis of a single example suggests that experimental science proceeds in this manner. Elements of experience, related by a relation A_1, are found to form a " routine" or demonstrable experiment, x_1. Other elements, related by A_2, form another

routine x_2. An element of x_1, forming a "mark" of it, is found (possibly in a single experiment) to be related by a relation B to an element of x_2, also forming a mark of it. It is concluded that these elements form a new routine y of higher order; moreover this routine is expressed by a law and not by a mere statement of fact; it is much more important. So also routines z, of yet higher order, are established by finding marks of y_1 and y_2 in a suitable relation C.

If the relations A, B, C, . . . form an identifiable class or classes, and if general criteria can be given to determine if any given element of a routine is a sufficient mark of it, then the process of finding laws (which is usually called Induction) can be reduced to rules. The principle underlying the rules will be that, if the elements a_1, b_1, being respectively marks of different routines x_1, x_2, are ever found to stand in one of these relations, then they will always stand in that relation. The relations will be "invariable relations." This principle will be similar to that of "causality," as expounded by Mill. But it will differ in two important respects. First, the invariable relation will not necessarily, as Mill maintained, contain a temporal element; second the field of the invariable relations will not be, as Mill apparently thought, any experiences whatever, but only those terms that are marks of routines.

In order to establish the principle of Induction, it is necessary to show that the invariable relations do indeed form an identifiable class or classes; for this purpose a close analysis of the relations asserted by admitted laws is required. I do not pretend that the task has been completed satisfactorily; the relations characteristic of science have not been studied as thoroughly as they deserve. But it seems to me that the analysis has proceeded far enough to make the view suggested highly plausible, and to make it permissible to assert that laws are simply assertions of invariable relations (but not necessarily causal relations) between marks of routines.

But an objection has to be considered. If the laws that science is discovering to-day have, as their terms, marks of routines already established, then there must come a stage, as we trace back the history of science, at which no routines were available to provide the terms of laws. An endless regression of routines is impossible; how did science ever start?

The answer is that the discovery of new laws is accompanied by the refinement of old routines. At any stage of a science there is a limited group of alleged routines. When two marks, one of each of two of these routines, are found to stand in an "invariable relation," it is usually found that the relation is indeed invariable, and that the marks so associated do indeed form a new routine. But sometimes the relation is found not to be invariable; the experiment cannot be repeated. The procedure then is not to reject the relation as not

invariable, but to modify the alleged routine, usually by dividing it into several routines differing in only a few elements. It has always been found possible by this method to restore the invariability of the relations. A typical example of this process occurred when the discovery of "heavy hydrogen" required the division into (at least) two routines of the single alleged routine called simply "hydrogen."

This process of refining routines at once makes induction possible —by preserving the invariability of "invariable relations"—and makes its results inevitably uncertain. There is no routine (and therefore no law) so certainly established that its revision is impossible; on the other hand, no observations can destroy our belief in the "uniformity of nature," that is to say, the existence of invariable relations. Nothing in science will be certainly true until science is complete—that is to say, never ; but nothing can ever prove it untrue. That is the formal paradox of induction. The utility of induction depends on the fortunate fact that the revision of routines that is necessary to preserve the invariability of relations is usually of small practical importance.

Theories explain laws. Explanation is not peculiar to science ; it plays a part in activities as diverse as metaphysics and criminal jurisprudence. It consists in showing that what is to be explained is, in some sense, a consequence of some intrinsically plausible hypothesis. If what is to be explained is more certain than the hypothesis, the process of explanation establishes the truth of the hypothesis; but if the hypothesis is the more certain, it may establish the truth of what is to be explained.

In a purely intellectual study, "consequence of" must mean "logical deduction from" and can apply only to formal propositions. If then laws are to be explained, they must be formal propositions concerning terms definable independently of the proposition they assert. The laws asserted in our treatises are certainly not of this character; if an attempt is made to state them in a form appropriate to deductive logic, they will be found to reduce (at the best) to existence theorems from which nothing can be deduced. This feature is probably unavoidable; for, even if the uncertainty in routines arising from the possibility of their refinement is ignored, they contain an element that cannot, in the last resort, be stated; it must be demonstrated. To convey what we really mean we must take our interlocutor into the laboratory, point to apparatus, and say that we mean *that.*

However, there is one part of certain laws that is expressible in formal propositions. A numerical law, such as Ohm's Law, that in certain circumstances a current is proportional to a potential difference, gives rise to a statement expressed in terms of the highly

developed symbolism of mathematics, and deducible by established mathematical reasoning from other propositions so expressed. Here then is something that can be explained without ambiguity. Numerical laws are characteristic of physics rather than of other sciences; that is why physics is much more theoretical than other sciences, and why those who are interested in theories all have tended to identify physics with the whole of science.

Since theories are thus intimately associated with numerical laws, it is clearly important to understand how these laws arise from the process of induction sketched above. We must have a "theory of measurement" (something quite different from what the mathematicians mean by that phrase) if we are to understand the structure of physics. Brevity forbids any attempt to expound the matter here, even in outline; but two remarks must be made.

The mathematical relation, generally denoted by $=$, does not express the whole of a numerical law; there is always a physical relation which is usually not expressed at all. Thus Ohm's Law is written $E = RI$; it is not usually stated that E, R, I must all be characteristic of the same resistor in the same state. It is not stated, partly because every practising physicist knows that it is implied (but that is not an adequate reason for its omission in elementary text-books), partly because (as has been said) it is impossible to state completely. But this part of the law is not less essential than the mathematical part. The fashionable habit of talking about "pointer readings" ignores the whole art of experimental physics and the immensely elaborate equipment with which it is now conducted.[1]

The other remark concerns "experimental error." The question is how this form of uncertainty is related to the form inherent in all induction and arising from the imperfect definition of routines. I hold that there is no connection, except in the entirely exceptional case of "statistical laws." Experimental error arises from the fact that the characteristic observable relation that gives rise to numerical laws is sometimes transitive (like the mathematical relation $=$), but not always. It does not arise at all in laws that are not numerical. The doctrine that experimental error can be reduced, or the certainty of induction increased, by the mere multiplication of observations is an error having no foundation in the actual practice of physics, and arising solely from a confusion between two distinct sources of uncertainty.

A theory then consists primarily of a set of mathematical pro-

[1] The inventor of "pointer readings" thought it worth while, during the Great War, to transport elaborate astronomical equipment to a remote oceanic island. If all he wanted was pointer readings, he need never have left home.

positions (hypotheses) from which the mathematical part of laws can be deduced. The hypothesis has to be intrinsically acceptable. In classical theories it was acceptable because it was the same as, or very like, the mathematical part of laws relating to systems other than those whose behaviour the theory is to explain; the theories were "mechanical." Modern theories are mathematical; their hypotheses are acceptable because they have the form to which some interesting or familiar branch of mathematical analysis is applicable.

But a theory cannot consist of a hypothesis alone ; for, if it did, it could not explain the physical part of laws and would have no relation to experiment. The relation to experiment is established by a "dictionary," which (like everything that concerns experiment) is never stated formally. It consists of entries relating to measurable magnitudes certain combinations of the variables characteristic of the hypothesis. Thus the Kinetic Theory of gases relates the quantity mv^2 (m = mass, v = velocity of a molecule) to the temperature of the gas; quantum mechanics relates the quantity $\psi\psi^*$ (ψ = wave function, ψ^* its conjugate) to the probability of something happening. In classical theories the dictionary entries usually are suggested immediately by the analogy on which the theory is based. In modern theories they are not so obvious; much of the technical discussion of relativity and wave-mechanics concerns the appropriateness of proposed entries.

A precise account of the relation thus established by the dictionary would require a discussion of the nature of measurement, and therefore must again be omitted. But one very important feature can be noted. The dictionary never relates each variable of the hypothesis singly to a measurable magnitude; thus, in our examples, neither v nor ψ is related singly; only combinations in which they are involved are related. It follows that a theory always contains some purely "hypothetical" ideas which have no meaning in terms of experiment, unless the whole theory is accepted.

This feature of theories enables them to be distinguished from laws even when the distinction is most liable to be obscured. Consider, for example, Maxwell's equations. These may appear at first to be a mere co-ordinated generalization of the laws of Ampère, Coulomb, Faraday, Ohm, etc. And so they are, if they are used to calculate (e.g.) the period of oscillation of the combination of a large condenser with a large inductor. For all the magnitudes involved (in particular the magnetic flux density B) are measurable; any step in the calculation can be checked by experiments that show that the laws involved are true in this special instance. But if the equations are used to calculate (e.g) the reflectance of a dielectric for light, B cannot be measured; the laws cannot be checked; the result of the calculation means something in terms of experiment, only because

there is a dictionary entry which relates B^2 to the intensity of the light polarized in a certain plane.

If this analysis is correct, it is clear that scientific propositions are of two perfectly distinct kinds and that any discussion of the implications of science that ignores the distinction must be of little value. But is it correct? To answer that question we must have a standard of correctness; here a difficulty is encountered that affects all attempts to expound a "logic of science," but has seldom been discussed openly.

Is the object to arrange in an order, conforming to the rules of formal logic, the propositions asserted in standard treatises? If so, the object is unattainable. The conventional terminology is so confused that, if we attempt to analyse what scientists say, our only conclusion must be that it is nonsense.

Is the object to disentangle from these imperfect propositions what physicists really mean by them? Again the task is impossible. There is an irrational element in science which is not expressible by any kind of logic, and yet confers on physics its meaning for physicists. They do not use words or symbols as instruments of thought in the characteristic part of their thinking; they use them merely to record what they have thought or to convey it to others with the same instincts. All "logics" assume that valid thought consists in the right handling of words or symbols; if there is any valid thought peculiar to science, that assumption is simply untrue.

Is the object to lay down a set of rules, imposed by some authority external to science, to which scientific thought must conform if it is to be true and disclose anything about the nature of reality? That view is obviously held by many philosophers, but no scientist can accept it; for him truth and reality mean that which is disclosed by scientific thought. A logic of this kind would be a logic of science only if science means something that no scientist believes.

A better view, I suggest, is that the purpose of any "logic of science" is to separate the rational element from the irrational, the part that is common to all kinds of organized thought from the part characteristic of science. A logic is the better, the more perfectly it effects this separation without omission and without distortion.

The analysis I have proposed does effect a separation. There are two irrational elements. One lies in the discovery of laws; the "fortunate fact" that gives science its practical value would not be a fact if scientists had not an instinctive and uncommunicable sense of what routines are likely to stand the test of further investigation and are thus worthy of provisional acceptance. The other lies in the formulation of theories; unless physicists' sense of what is "intrinsically acceptable" were confirmed by the prediction of true laws, there would be no theoretical physics.

But candour compels the admission that the separation is not entirely complete, and that there are connections between laws and theories that have not been mentioned. Thus theories often provide a great part of the evidence for laws; "empirical laws" having no theoretical foundations are suspect. Again novelty is an essential part of explanation; theories may lose their character by mere familiarity and become no more than compendiums of the laws they originally explained. The equations of Newtonian Dynamics have long been in this position; it has become more evident since the theory of which they were once the hypothesis has been abandoned.

However, the more serious question is: Who is to judge that there has been no omission or distortion? Of course the consensus of physicists ought to be the deciding factor, but most physicists cannot be induced to take any interest in the matter. They have a horror of logic, and resent any attempt to show that their thought contains any logical element at all. In these circumstances every proposed " logic of science" is apt to be simply an attempt to answer the particular questions that interest its author.

It may be well therefore to indicate what questions my analysis will answer. Its great merit to my mind is that it renders intelligible the changes that physics has undergone during the last twenty years and, in particular, the apparent paradox that, during a period when (as we are constantly assured) the deepest foundations of the science have been destroyed, its pragmatic truth—its power of influencing the life of mankind—has been greater than ever before. To resolve that paradox we must distinguish between laws, on which alone the practical value of a science depends, and theories which, except in so far as they lead to the discovery of laws, have no practical value whatever.

Moreover, the analysis was originally based almost wholly on classical physics; it was complete while relativity had not gone beyond the "special" theory or quantum mechanics beyond Planckian oscillators. The development of these great theories, and the modifications of accepted routines that are at once its cause and its result, have followed precisely the lines that the analysis indicated as possible. The work of Minkowski and of Bohr, which rendered possible the transition from mechanical to mathematical theories, might have been conducted with the object of illustrating its principles. I cannot therefore help feeling that it may be of service to those numerous persons who, looking at science from the outside, appear to have found its recent history bewildering.

THE RELATIONS OF PHILOSOPHY

(*Continuation of Article "An Approach to Philosophy," Vol. X, No. 37.*)

PROFESSOR JARED S. MOORE

PHILOSOPHY, like some people, has many relations; and, as in the case of people with large family connections, it is possible to learn a good deal more about the nature of philosophy if we consider its relations with other members of the family to which it belongs. In this family are included, along with philosophy itself, two extremely important human interests, science and religion, all of which have a common concern in the fundamental problems of human experience, and attempt in various ways to satisfy man's need of adjusting himself to the universe which lies about him. Of these three related interests, Religion may be thought of as one of the parents of Philosophy, and the various Sciences as its children. As to the other parent, I suspect that its name is Art, and that all of these have Experience as their common progenitor. Eliminating metaphor, it is certainly true that experience is the instigator of all human activities, that religion and art are direct expressions or consequents of experience, and that philosophy and science are ways of elaborating and further developing experience and its consequents.

In the following sections of this paper, it shall be our endeavour to consider in turn the relations between philosophy and the sciences, philosophy and religion, and philosophy and the fine arts. Such a consideration involves in each case three questions: (1) What have these two types of interest in common? (2) How do they differ? and (3) How does each act upon the other?

PHILOSOPHY AND THE SCIENCES

Philosophy and science are *alike* in their "impartial love of truth."[1] in their common *desire to know* for the sake of knowing. As has already been intimated, they are both ways of reflecting upon our experience for the purpose of gaining a better understanding thereof; attempts to understand life, as distinguished from merely enjoying or living it; theories about life, not ways of living.

In the early days of man's reflection upon his experience, these now distinct interests were indistinguishable: primitive science is also primitive philosophy, and the earlier chapters in books on the

[1] Brightman, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 10.

history of science and of philosophy are likely to cover much the same topics. But as time goes on we find some striking *differences* arising between them, which may now be considered under four successive heads: differences (1) as to scope, (2) as to their respective attitudes toward the universe, (3) as to their respective attitudes toward what is known as "the problem of reality," and (4) as to method.

(1) The simplest and most obvious distinction is that of *scope*, or inclusiveness of subject-matter. Every science is interested in some special portion of the universe, or some special aspect of experience: philosophy is interested in the universe as a whole, and in particular facts only in the light of the whole, or for the light which they may throw upon the nature of the whole. Thus we speak properly not so much of "science" as of "the sciences"; but we speak of "philosophy" in the singular number, and the special philosophical interests we call "branches of philosophy" or "philosophical disciplines." For example: among the sciences we have one, astronomy, interested in the various large bodies which make up the physical universe, and another, geology, which devotes itself to a more thorough study of that one cosmic body on which man happens to live; one science, botany, which studies plants, and another, zoology, which takes animals rather than plants for its subjects of investigation; one science, physics, to consider one set of material phenomena, and another, chemistry, to investigate another set of these phenomena; one science, physiology, to study the bodily aspect of human nature, and another, psychology, to study its mental aspect. As contrasted with these special fields, the philosopher, as Francis Bacon said of himself, "takes all knowledge for his province," and is, in the words of Plato, a "spectator of all time and of all existence."

When we consider this vast field which philosophy claims for its own—"the breadth of its scope," as we put it in our earlier article—we are not surprised that there should be such wide diversities of opinion among philosophers, even wider diversities than there are among scientists. In a small field of investigation one may hope to learn a great deal, but for a philosopher to pretend to any considerable knowledge of such a vast field as "reality in general" would be absurd. A difference of *intention*, then, arises: the scientist seeks for an intimate and detailed knowledge of his own selected field of experience: the philosopher seeks for a glimpse, and cannot expect ever to attain more than a glimpse, of the entire universe—a "synoptic view," as it is now often called, of the whole, ignoring the details.

(2) Another way in which philosophy and the sciences differ is in

the *attitudes* they respectively take toward the universe which they both study, or the interest each has in that universe. On this point, science is interested in *facts* for their own sake, and in their causes: philosophy is interested in the *significance* of those facts for man—in ends, purposes, and values—rather than facts as such. In other words, science takes a detached, impersonal interest in things; whereas philosophy takes an intimate, personal interest in them. So, when the distinction is made, as it used to be made perhaps more commonly than it is now, between two great groups of studies in the educational curriculum—the sciences and the "humanities"—philosophy is always found, along with history, literature, and the arts, among the humanities.

In consequence of this diversity of interests, we find science and philosophy tending to view the world in very different ways. This difference is perhaps not so important as the others, and has not always obtained; but as science and philosophy have developed in the course of their history, the tendency in this direction is quite marked. The distinction may best be put in terms of the diverse *ideals* toward which science and philosophy respectively aim: the ideal of science is what is called a causal or *mechanistic* ideal, whereas the ideal of philosophy is a purposive or *teleological* one. By this is meant that the scientist thinks of the universe as like a vast machine in which everything that occurs has its definite causes and results, and seeks to discover in each case what these causes and effects are; whereas the philosopher inquires rather about the *purposes* of things—seeks to discover whether the world and the things and events in it have a purpose, and if so what that purpose is. For example, science has shown that everything evolves, and in a general kind of way *how* things evolve: the philosopher wants to know *why* things evolve in just the way they do, and what the goal of that evolution may be.

(3) A third distinction between philosophy and the sciences has to do with their respective attitudes toward what philosophers call "*the Problem of Reality*." This is a distinctively philosophical problem —perhaps *the* central philosophical problem—in which scientists as such have no interest. Science, as it is often said, is interested solely in "*phenomena*"—i.e. things as they appear: philosophy is interested in *reality*—i.e. things as they really are. It is extremely important that we make this distinction especially clear, if we are to avoid serious misunderstanding; and first let us explain what is meant by a "phenomenon," for this is one of the most important of philosophical as well as scientific terms.

Literally a phenomenon is an appearance (from the Greek φαίνω, I show, shine, or appear). As the term is used technically in English, it stands for anything that appears to the human mind—whether to

the senses (material or physical phenomena), or to introspection (mental or psychical phenomena). Even those imperceptible particles of matter which physics infers from what it perceives—electrons, neutrons, etc.—are in this sense phenomena, since they appear to the human reason if not to the senses, as underlying that which does appear to the senses. In popular usage the word is often restricted to what is unusual or exceptional in nature: the ordinary person would not hesitate to call a total eclipse of the sun or a five-legged calf a phenomenon, but would never think of applying the term to the daily shining of the sun in the heavens or to a calf with the normal number of legs; and yet these latter are just as much "phenomena" as the former. The phenomena of nature, then, are just the facts of nature; and for all ordinary purposes "phenomenon" and "fact," "object," or "thing" may be regarded as virtually synonymous terms, though a philosopher interested in words might not be willing to take them as absolutely identical in meaning.

Now when we say that science is interested in phenomena or appearances and philosophy in reality, let us not make the mistake of supposing that the scientist would for a moment admit that his phenomena are *un*real, or that they are *merely* appearances: the point is simply that the scientist as such is *not interested* in the question of the nature of reality, but merely in things as they present themselves to his investigating consciousness. But that is the very thing in which the philosopher—and the scientist too *when he philosophizes* (as scientists nowadays frequently do)—*is* interested. In fact, as we said above, the "problem of reality" is in many ways the central philosophical problem—the problem, namely, of whether or not phenomena "really are" what they appear to be, the problem of what is the true relation between appearance and reality. Science, on the contrary, is not interested in this question one way or the other. And it is because of this special interest that we praised philosophy in our previous article for the "depth of its foundations."

(4) Finally, one of the most characteristic distinctions between philosophy and science as we find them to-day is the distinction of *method*. Every science bases its conclusions on careful observation, under experimental conditions when possible, and arrives at them by generalizing from the facts thus observed according to the method of reasoning known as "induction": the philosopher attempts, on the basis of the results obtained by all the sciences, and also from such other sources as religious and aesthetic experiences, to attain through reasoning a "synoptic view" of reality in its wholeness. The subject of philosophical method is so important that it deserves separate consideration at some other time, but in the present context this must suffice.

The various distinctions above drawn may become clearer if we illustrate them as they apply to the problems of *psychology*. When we hear this word to-day we naturally think of a science concerned with a specific group of phenomena, but this was not always the case. By derivation, psychology is the study of the soul, and yet rarely indeed in any present-day psychological treatise will one find any mention of the soul whatever. In other words, originally psychology was a branch of philosophy concerned with the question of the nature, origin, and destiny of the soul; whereas now, at least as ordinarily understood, it is a distinct science concerned with the phenomena of mental life or of human behaviour. And yet as a matter of fact both sets of problems are of as vital importance to-day as they ever were, and the term "psychology" has a philosophical as well as a scientific significance. As *science*, then, and in the usual meaning of the term, psychology is concerned, let us say, with the phenomena of mental life, *how* the mind *works*, what the "laws" of human behaviour are; whereas *philosophical* psychology is concerned with the question as to *what* the mind *is*, the nature of the self or of personality, the relation between the mind and the body, and the relation between the mind of man and the universe beyond him.

Having considered the resemblances and differences between philosophy and the sciences, we come now to the subject of their *interdependence*. How does each act upon the other? What does each contribute to the work of the other? For the relation *is* a mutual one, and may be taken up from each side successively.

First, then, what do the sciences contribute to philosophy? Well, if science is concerned with facts, and philosophy with their interpretation, the answer is fairly simple: science contributes the facts which philosophy endeavours to interpret, the materials with which philosophy works. In this, philosophy is entirely dependent on the sciences. In former times philosophers were sadly inclined to forget this, and to formulate out of their own *a priori* thinking—i.e. thinking independently of observational knowledge—what they called "philosophies of nature" which quite ignored any obligation of being, as we would now say, scientific. The two great German philosophers of a century ago, Schelling and Hegel, were notorious offenders in this matter. The natural consequence of this was to arouse considerable antagonism to philosophy on the part of scientists—an antagonism which unfortunately persists even to the present day in some quarters, though happily this becomes less and less as time goes on. Really there is no excuse for such antagonism to-day, since all philosophers of any importance now fully recognize their dependence on science, and many scientists are themselves much interested in the philosophical significance of their own work: in fact, any scientist

who is contemptuous or apprehensive of philosophy to-day is simply a century behind the times on this matter, however up to date or ahead of it he may be in his own field!

But there is another side to this relationship, the contribution of philosophy to the sciences, which cannot be stated quite so simply. As we saw in our previous article, philosophy is not so much (as is science) a "body of conclusions" based on observations as a "spirit or method of approaching experience";[1] and it is much easier to define a body than it is a spirit. And yet, though every scientist works in a limited field on a limited "body" of facts, it is perfectly possible for him to carry on his investigations in a broad philosophical "spirit," keeping ever in mind the great truth of the unity of all knowledge, the interrelation of all the various specific fields. Perhaps we may say, then, on this side of our general question, that philosophy contributes breadth and depth to science. And yet there is much more to be said about this.

As these two intellectual interests have developed, philosophy has come to appropriate to itself three specific functions in relation to science. These functions are: (1) to unify the results of the various sciences into a single comprehensive system; (2) to investigate the methods common to all the sciences; and (3) to analyse critically the fundamental concepts and assumptions of the sciences. Let us elborate these points. (1) If each science covers but a limited field of knowledge, and yet if all knowledge is interrelated, there must be some discipline whose duty it shall be to coordinate and so far as possible unify these various fields; and that function most naturally falls within the purview of philosophy. (2) Every science has its own distinctive methods of working its own particular field, and yet there is a general "scientific method" or way of working which is common to all the sciences, and it becomes natural for philosophy to take upon itself the study of these common methods: this particular philosophical interest is often called "methodology," and is usually regarded as a branch of logic. (3) Every science makes use of certain concepts peculiar to itself (e.g. the concept of igneous rocks in geology, or of memory in psychology), and it is the function and duty of each science to formulate and develop its own distinctive concepts; and yet there are also a number of more general concepts which are common to all or to large groups of sciences—such concepts, for example, as cause, natural law, matter, life, mind, etc.—and which it is one of the functions of philosophy to analyse and define. In connection with this last service also there are certain assumptions that the scientist makes in the use of these concepts, and these the philosopher must examine to the end of justifying (or the reverse) and clarifying them —such as the assumption that every event has a cause, that life is found only in connection with some material organism, etc. Professor

[1] The quotations are from Brightman's *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 7.

C. D. Broad has proposed to give the special name of "Critical Philosophy" to this part of the philosopher's programme.[1]

The three functions just described constitute together what is now most commonly designated the "Philosophy of Science." Some scholars—positivists, as they are called—would restrict philosophy entirely to these, and compel it to give up the attempt to do anything more than unify the results, study the common methods, and analyse the common concepts, of the various sciences. But this is entirely too limited a view of the place of philosophy in the world, since over and above these purely scientific interests and problems there are many *ultra-scientific* interests and problems which carry us far beyond even the vast field of all the sciences taken together, and these the true philosopher cannot ignore. These include problems about the "meanings, purposes, and values" of the facts and truths which science has discovered for us, the nature and implications of religious experience, and the nature and implications of aesthetic experience—i.e. the experience of the artist and the art- and nature-lover. Philosophy in its wholeness, then, attempts to correlate not merely the various fields of scientific experience, but *all* types of experience, into a single world-view: in other words, in Broad's terminology, philosophy has a "speculative" as well as a "critical" function (*loc. cit.*).

Before leaving the subject of philosophy and the sciences, there is a closely related topic to which we must give our attention. This is the question as to the distinction between philosophical and scientific knowledge on the one hand, and the knowledge of the ordinary person—the "plain man," or "man in the street," as philosophers like to call him—on the other; or between philosophy, science, and "*common sense*," as it is often now called.

The simplest account of this distinction is that presented by Herbert Spencer, the noted philosopher of evolution, in his work entitled *First Principles of a New System of Philosophy* (first edition, 1862). As Spencer therein regards these three types of knowledge, they differ from one another solely in the *degree* to which they respectively unify our understanding of the world; common sense, he says, or, as he calls it, "knowledge of the lowest kind is *un-unified* knowledge; Science is *partially-unified* knowledge; Philosophy is *completely-unified* knowledge" (*op. cit.*, § 37). From what has just been said on these matters it can be readily seen that here Spencer is adopting the positivistic position that philosophy is simply the system of all the sciences, and this position has already been rejected. But more important is it for us to note that in this analysis Spencer ignores any possibility of the second distinction between philosophy

[1] See his article in *Contemporary British Philosophy*, First Series (The Macmillan Company, 1924).

and the sciences which we drew above—viz. the distinction in their respective attitudes toward the world: for Spencer, there is no such distinction in attitude, but the difference between common sense, science, and philosophy is merely one of degree.

The late George Stuart Fullerton, of Columbia University, in the second chapter of his valuable *Introduction to Philosophy*, has put us in his debt by calling attention to this question of attitudes. As he sees the matter, science differs from "common thought" only in degree—its greater degree of accuracy, thoroughness, and systematization; but philosophy, or "reflective thought," as he calls it, presents an entirely different *kind* of view of the world, or takes an entirely different attitude toward it. According to his account, when we study science we do not in any sense leave behind us the world of ordinary experience, but merely examine that world more carefully and more thoroughly; but as soon as we begin to philosophize we find ourselves in quite another atmosphere, and "the real world in which we all rejoice" seems "to dissolve and disappear" (*op. cit.*, page 30).

Here we have two quite different reports as to the distinction between common sense, science, and philosophy: for Spencer they differ merely in degree; for Fullerton, common sense and science differ only in degree, but philosophy differs from both the others in point of view. Which of these is right? Or is the true theory different from either of these? Which is really nearer to common sense in its attitude toward the world, science or philosophy? That there is a large degree of truth in both the Spencerian and the Fullertonian accounts is, I think, unquestionable, and yet perhaps neither quite touches on the heart of the matter. Certainly the world of ordinary experience is a world of values and purposes as is the world of philosophy, not merely a world of facts and causes as is the world of science. Both philosophy and common sense take the world in its concrete wholeness, whereas science abstracts and mechanizes. It would seem, then, that we should on the whole regard the attitude of the philosopher as the same as that of the plain man, as contrasted with the more abstract and artificial attitude of the scientist. That is to say, paraphrasing William James,[1] philosophy is merely a more persistent attempt to understand the world of common sense.

Philosophy and Religion.[2]

The relation of philosophy to religion can be best made clear if we

[1] *Psychology, Briefer Course*, p. 461.

[2] By religion, as the term is here used, is to be understood that human activity in which man feels himself to be in personal contact with a personal Deity. This is not intended as a comprehensive definition applicable to anything that anyone might call religion, but a statement of how the term as used in this article is to be understood.

inquire first as to the ways in which religion is allied to philosophy and distinguished from science, and then as to how religion differs from both philosophy and science.

On the first point, I think that if we rehearse the various contrasts already drawn between philosophy and the sciences we shall find religion on the side of philosophy—that is to say, that *religion is like philosophy and unlike science in all the ways in which philosophy and the sciences were distinguished above.* In other words, taking into the account the position of common sense, the attitude of religion, like that of philosophy and unlike that of science, is the attitude of common sense. We shall now proceed to draw our comparisons, though in doing so we shall not follow quite the same order of points as we did in our previous section.

Religion, we find, is (1) interested in the *significance* and *value* of things for man, rather than in facts for their own sake; and (2) views the world, not as a system of causally related phenomena, but as an instrument of a *divine purpose.* That is to say, religion, like philosophy, takes the *teleological* rather than the mechanistic attitude toward the world. If these two points had always been taken into consideration, many famous "conflicts between religion and science" might have been avoided. Let us recall the two great scientific conceptions which brought about the most important of these so-called conflicts—the Copernican theory propounded in the sixteenth century, and the Darwinian theory propounded in the nineteenth.

Copernicus showed that the earth on which we live, instead of being the centre of the universe, with the sun and planets revolving about it (the Ptolemaic view), is really itself but one of the planets revolving about the sun as *their* centre. Which of these two views of the relation between the earth and the sun is correct is a question of *fact,* a question of *science*; and quite regardless of the still newer view of Professor Einstein and the relativists on this matter, the scientific truth undoubtedly lies on the side of Copernicus. But what has all this to do with religion? What possible difference can it make to man in his spiritual relations with God whether the sun revolves around the earth or the earth revolves around the sun? The question really has no "significance and value for man," and so, properly understood, is not a religious question at all. If the Church in the sixteenth century had realized this, much trouble and disaster could have been avoided.

Similarly as to the Darwinian theory of the origin of man. What difference can it make to religion whether God created man directly, or brought the human species into existence through descent from other animal species? The doctrine of evolution is an attempt to explain *how* man came into existence, the natural *causes* which brought him about: it is, therefore, a purely *scientific* theory, and has

no significance one way or the other for religion. True, the religious view of the world implies that man owes his origin to God, that God is "Creator" of the universe and all things therein; but its *primary* implication is that God brought man into the world for a *purpose*, and *how* this result was accomplished makes no difference whatever to religion.

Continuing with our comparison, two other points remain to be considered. Religion, like philosophy but unlike science, is interested (3) in *reality as a whole*, rather than in any particular portion of it; and is interested (4) in *reality as distinguished from phenomena.* As illustrative of the former point it may be noted that religion has often actually been *defined* as the attitude which a man takes toward the universe as a whole, and God as the "Universal Being"; and the common designation of God as the "Supreme Being" corroborates the truth that for religion He is the ultimate reality of the universe, and in no sense a "phenomenon."

The above comparisons, therefore, seem to indicate the alignment of religion with philosophy rather than with science. But there are other ways in which religion is as sharply distinguished from philosophy as it is from science; and we pass now to a consideration of these.

Religion is unlike both philosophy and science (1) in that it is a *way of living*, whereas philosophy and science are *theories* about life. In other words, the aim of philosophy and science is knowledge: the aim of religion is personal fellowship with God and the inspiration of daily life. Philosophy and science take a purely intellectual interest in the world: religion takes an emotional and practical interest in it. Philosophy and science appeal to the intellect alone—the "head," as we sometimes say: religion appeals primarily to the "heart" and the will. In all these points (or, rather, ways of elucidating the one point), the close relation which subsists between religion and *morality* is evident—religion as concerned with man's vital relations with God, and morality with right living in purely human affairs. In its essential nature, then, religion is not to be thought of as belonging in the same class with philosophy at all, any more than with science; but rather with morality and ordinary living. As brought out in our earlier article, it is a way of living rather than a way of understanding life.

But in drawing this contrast it is to be noted that we have not anywhere denied that religion *does* have an interest in knowledge. Philosophy and science, we said, "take a *purely* intellectual interest in the world," appeal to the intellect *alone*"; whereas religion "appeals *primarily*," not solely, to "the heart and the will." Properly speaking, religion is something that appeals to *all* sides of human

nature, takes man in his concrete wholeness; though its *emphasis* is on the emotional and practical sides of that nature, whereas philosophy and science are *purely* intellectual pursuits. All worthwhile religion must be *based* on knowledge, if it is not to degenerate into mere sentimentalism—a morbid and unintelligent gush of emotion. Recognition of the importance of such an intellectual basis for religion has led to the production of various systems of *theology*, which attempt to formulate and organize the concepts and propositions which underlie the practice of religion. Theology, then, belongs with science and philosophy among the intellectual disciplines which engage the interest of men: it is an essential basis for any worthwhile religion, but must never be identified or confused with religion.

As to the *function of knowledge*, then, there is a second way in which religion differs from both philosophy and the sciences: (2) religion is life, and knowledge is merely *instrumental* to it; whereas for philosophy and science, knowledge is an *end in itself*. Furthermore, there is a difference as to the *method* by which knowledge is attained in the two fields: (3) philosophical and scientific knowledge is of the type known as *discursive*—i.e. the result of reflection, reasoned out, argued about; whereas religious knowledge is *intuitive*—i.e. direct, immediate, the result of experience aided by faith. In this latter point again religion is seen to be allied to ordinary life; for in both the spiritual and the material fields we live by experience and not by reasoning, however different the experience may be in the two cases. But science and philosophy are "rational inquiries" into the implications of those experiences.

Finally, (4) religion is a concern of *individuals*—man and God, and the relation between them: philosophy and science are concerned with *universals*—concepts, classes of things, "laws." In making this distinction, however, we must take care not to make the mistake of thinking of religion as concerned with individuals in their isolation —God and my own soul only; but rather as concerned with *all* men, with individuals as *social*, not as solitary, beings. For just as without an intelligent background religion becomes one-sidedly sentimental, so without a consideration for others it becomes purely selfish.

We are now ready to consider the *interdependence* of philosophy and religion. As in the case of philosophy and science, each contributes to the other.

Religion, like science, contributes data for philosophy to work upon. As we saw above, though philosophy is greatly dependent upon science for its materials, it is not limited in this dependence upon science alone, but must take into consideration other types of experience besides that upon which science itself is based. The data

of religion, then, are as important as those of science, as materials for a complete philosophy.

Conversely, philosophy contributes strength and depth to the beliefs of religion—strengthens them by giving them a firmer intellectual foundation and so saving religion from sentimentalism. It must be acknowledged, of course, that often the effect of the study of philosophy is to weaken rather than to strengthen one's religious beliefs; but this, I am convinced, is because one has not gone deeply enough in his study of the implications of experiencence. Francis Bacon the philosopher and Alexander Pope the poet agree in their advice on this matter. "It is true," says Bacon, "that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth man's mind about to religion." And to this the poet adds, in a familiar couplet:

> A little learning is a dangerous thing:
> Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring.

A brief study of philosophical problems cannot, it is true, carry us very far or very deep; but we can at least be warned against jumping to conclusions!

Philosophy and the Fine Arts

Under the expression "fine arts" are to be understood such human productions as poems, musical compositions, pictures, statues, buildings, etc.—works which are intended to be beautiful, or enjoyable merely in the contemplation of them, quite apart from any usefulness they may have as instruments of some end beyond themselves. A building, for example, may be useful as a residence or as a house of worship, or a vase as something to hold flowers in; and yet it may give one pleasure just to look at such an object without making any use of it whatever. And as for pictures, statues, poems, and pieces of music, they may be utterly useless, and yet tremendously enjoyable to look at or listen to.

It is a curious fact that though practically all writers on the general problems of philosophy discuss at length the relations between philosophy and the sciences, and though most of these give considerable attention also to the relations between philosophy and religion, the parallel question regarding philosophy and the fine arts is apt to be entirely neglected, and the only art which seems ever even to be mentioned in this connection is poetry. Now we can easily understand why poetry should be favoured above the other arts in this matter, and shall later give special consideration to this relationship; but the broader question is quite as important as any which we have yet discussed.

At the outset let it be agreed that many works of art seem to have no philosophical significance whatever, and so do not bear upon our problem. Many paintings, for example, are mere patterns in line and colour, many poems or pieces of music merely rhythmic sequences of tones or articulate sounds. But notwithstanding this, there is a vast field of art which does have philosophical significance (such as, for example, the types of poetry known as "reflective" and "didactic" poetry), and if we examine these works I think we shall find that, like religion, they manifest the *same point of view as technical philosophy* as distinguished from that of science—i.e. interest in *meanings, purposes, and values*; in the *synoptic* view of things; and in *reality* as distinguished from mere appearances. Much fine art *is*, as we have just acknowledged, a matter of "surface appearance," as it is sometimes called—sensuous patterns, reflections of light, etc.; but the more profound forms go far beneath this surface into the inner meanings of things. And even when a given work is concerned entirely with surface appearances, its *beauty*, even if merely sensuous beauty, is not merely a *fact* about a picture or a poem—as is, for example, the fact that the picture is painted in oils, or that the poem is composed in iambic hexameters—but a *value* which the work has for an appreciative observer or reader.

It is this relationship that Aristotle had in mind when he said, "poetry is more philosophical than history." In this saying, "poetry" is used as representative of all that we have called the fine arts, and "history" is synonymous with all the merely descriptive sciences; and the proposition asserts (among other things which do not now concern us), as we have done, that of these three interests, art is nearer to philosophy than is science.

As in our earlier section we instituted a comparison between the ordinary person, the scientist, and the philosopher in the matter of knowledge; so now let us similarly illustrate the respective attitudes of these three types of individuals toward nature, making use of two familiar poems for this purpose.

The plain man is well represented by *Peter Bell*, of whom Wordsworth tells us

> A primrose by a river's brim
> A yellow primrose was to him,
> And it was nothing more.

He had always called that yellow thing that grew by the side of the river a primrose. His father had always called it that before he was born, and *his* father before him, so why make a fuss about it!

The botanist tells us a good deal more about it. In the first place, he does not call it simply a yellow primrose, but gives it a far more

impressive name—*Primula vulgaris*, of the family *Primulaceae*. It has spoon-shaped, deeply veined leaves, he tells us, and bears its blossoms on single-flowered scapes. Its corolla is salver-shaped, divided into five lobes, with five stamens included. He groups it among the gamopetalous angiospermae, and traces its origin for us to more primitive forms. And when he is through, we sigh, thank him graciously, and say, not unlike Peter Bell, "well, what of it after all!"

Then comes the philosopher, with his synoptic viewpoint, and exclaims with Tennyson,

> Flower in the crannied wall,
> I pluck you out of the crannies,
> I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
> Little flower—but if I could understand
> What you are, root and all, and all in all,
> I should know what God and man is.

And even though it is true that many philosophers would repudiate any literal acceptance of the ideas expressed in this poem, the lines nevertheless represent a philosophical, as distinguished from an ordinary or a scientific attitude toward nature. The philosopher does not simply accept the flower without asking questions, nor does he merely try to tell us all the facts that he can discover about it, but he asks about its *meaning* and its place in the universe. And, be it noted, it is the ordinary and the philosophical points of view that most naturally find expression in poetry—the botanist would find the language of the artist quite inappropriate for expressing what he has to say.

Now let us see *how philosophy and fine art differ*. Most essentially they differ (1) as to the *Ideal* at which each aims, the supreme value by which each is estimated. For philosophy (as also for science and for religion) this ideal is *Truth*, which by nature expresses itself in propositions: for fine art the ideal is *Beauty*, whose nature it is to express itself in material forms—words, tones, colours, masses, etc. There are a number of profound concepts of the human mind which are of interest alike to the philosopher and the artist—Life, Death, Love, Nature, God. These are distinctly philosophical ideas, and yet the mere naming of them will recall to the thoughtful reader at once any number of instances of works of art which have taken one or more of these ideas as their subject. We may mention, for example, Hamlet's famous soliloquy on life and death ; or the representations of the conflict between love and death in the painting by G. F. Watts denominated *Love and Death*, and in the music of Wagner's great lyric drama, *Tristan und Isolde*, especially the closing passage.

And yet see how differently philosopher and artist *treat* these great

themes. In each case the philosopher is interested *solely* in the ideas themselves, the artist is interested *also* in their material expression. Both are interested in the ideas; but whereas this is the philosopher's *sole* concern, it is *also* a concern of the artist to express these ideas in outwardly pleasing forms. In Watts's picture, for example, the conflict between love and death is symbolized by two figures—one tall and fully draped, its features hidden, representing Death, forcing his way through a door; and the other, Love, represented by a naked youth facing the observer, and trying vainly with outstretched arm to prevent his opponent from accomplishing his purpose. All this is done "beautifully," as we say, through intrinsically pleasing lines, colours, and representations of natural objects; and the artist is at least as interested in these outward forms as he is in the ideas symbolized therebv.

A philosophical theory, therefore, is a system of abstract ideas (concepts or "universals") *only*: though the philosopher must needs use outward forms (words) to record and communicate these ideas, these words are not parts of the theory, but expressions of it merely. A work of art, on the other hand, is a system of ideas expressed in concrete material form: the ideas may be abstract universals (love, death, etc.), but they are symbolized by means of concrete individuals (as the two figures in Watts's picture); and these outward forms are actually elements in the work of art itself.

A second distinction between philosophy and fine art parallels the third one drawn above between philosophy and religion, viz.: (2) philosophy, like science, is *reflective*—a matter of reasoning and argument; fine art, like religion (and common sense), is *intuitive*—a matter of imagination ("insight," "vision") rather than reasoning, an expression of feeling rather than of intellectual argument. In the words of Browning's *Abt Vogler*,

> The rest may reason and welcome: 'tis we musicians know.

Philosophers may argue and confute one another, scientists may analyse and classify; but through it all the artist, the poet, the musician, like the mystic and the man of faith, remains serene and confident—he sees for himself, he *knows*!

At the beginning of this section it was pointed out that of the various fine arts, *poetry* is the one most closely allied to philosophy. The reason for this is clear enough—that both philosophy and poetry make use of *words* as their media of expression. Many great men of past and present combine the two interests of philosopher and poet—notably Lucretius the ancient Roman, Dante the medieval Italian, and Goethe the modern German—called by George Santayana, himself a poet as well as a philosopher, the "Three Philosophical

Poets," and discussed by him in a book by that title. Of more recent poets of the English tongue we recall especially, perhaps, such ones as Robert Browning and Ralph Waldo Emerson. All of these, with the possible exception of Lucretius,[1] we think of as primarily poets, but poets of a distinctly philosophical type of mind.

Then there are those others whom we think of as philosophers first of all, but philosophers of a lyrical type, noted as much for their literary style as for their philosophical ideas: most honoured for his supremacy in this combination of excellences is Plato, whose dialogues are literary as well as philosophical masterpieces; and among contemporary writers, Mr. Santayana, already cited for his book on the three poet-philosophers, should certainly be included in the same category. In contrast to such philosophers as Plato and Santayana one thinks of their equally great respective contemporaries, Aristotle[2] and Whitehead,[3] as pre-eminent in the field of thought, but hardly so in the field of letters. Similar contrasts might be drawn between such alluring writers as Descartes and Berkeley on the one hand, and the more formal Spinoza and Kant on the other; or, among the great German followers of Kant, the literary Schopenhauer and the profound but far from charming Hegel. It is true that none of the philosophers named in the present paragraph couched their ideas in the language of verse; but prose literature at its best is also a fine art, and thinkers who are able to present their thoughts in attractive prose deserve, along with their poetical brethren, to be called artists.

Taking poetry, then, as the fine art nearest allied to philosophy, what are the outstanding *differences* between these? These differences will, of course, be merely applications of the differences already noted between philosophy and the fine arts in general to the specific conditions of the distinctive medium of poetry—i.e. differences in the use of words. (1) To the poet, words are essential elements of his art, ends in themselves as well as means of conveying ideas; whereas to the philosopher they are means only—necessary for recording and communicating his ideas, but of no interest in themselves. As a natural consequence of this distinction there follows another: (2) the

[1] It is hard to say whether we should call Lucretius a "philosophical poet" or a "poet philosopher." The present writer would rather prefer to say the latter—that, apart from some of the earliest philosophers, who also wrote metrically, Lucretius is the one example in history of a philosopher of the first rank who presented his ideas in masterly verse.

[2] At least this is true of the main body of the works of Aristotle which have survived. We are told, however, that he did write other works of real literary quality.

[3] I do not, of course, mean for a moment to deny that Professor Whitehead's writings often do possess real literary charm, when their author is not taking his duties as a philosopher too seriously.

philosophical poet endeavours to express his ideas in as beautiful forms (words and sequences of words) as possible, when necessary sacrificing accuracy and systematic presentation to style and emotional expression; whereas the technical philosopher makes truth his chief concern, even at the expense of style and emotional appeal. Because of this contrast in aim and emphasis, verse, with its extensive use of concrete imagery, is the preferred medium of the former type of writer; whereas the language of the technical philosopher tends to be decidedly "prosaic" (not to say, "prosy") and abstract.

On the matter of the *interdependence* of philosophy and fine art nothing novel appears to be said, since the situation here is precisely analogous to that between philosophy and religion. Aesthetic experience—the experience of the artist, the art lover, and the lover of nature—like religious experience, contributes data for the philosopher to develop; and, conversely, as we have seen all along, philosophy contributes profound ideas to the artist, and without philosophy art might easily fall into triviality. But on the whole it must be confessed that this interrelation is not so important as in the cases of science and of religion.

PHILOSOPHICAL SURVEY

PHILOSOPHY IN GERMANY

PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE

It is not the purpose of a Survey to give a detailed analysis of certain books like a single review, but rather to draw the attention of the reader to works of some importance and use to him, and to indicate, if possible, some general trends of thought of to-day. Whereas our last survey was devoted to Philosophy of History, we take under review to-day some books on the Philosophy of Nature, that is philosophy of physics, chemistry, and biology, and we finish with some historical books on the subject.

In doing so, we notice first of all a quite different situation. While Philosophy of History, still in its Pre-Copernican stage, tries to establish a real basis and to find fundamental notions of history, the philosophy of physics is faced with different problems. Here, on the contrary, the traditional concepts, derived from a former stage of physics and established in the classical system of modern physics and in the corresponding philosophical systems from Descartes to Kant and their followers, are no longer valid. The internal transformation of physics is so far-reaching that philosophers are at a loss to know either what to make of it or how to keep their old standpoint and concepts, accommodating them to the new situation in physics, or finally how to change their own point of view.

There is no better introduction into the present situation of physics than A. Einstein's and L. Infeld's new book,[1] which gives a thrilling account of the dramatic development of modern physics from Galileo up to the present. It is philosophically important because it concentrates on the chief internal philosophical impulses and intuitions at work in modern physics. It starts with Galileo and with the development and well-known breakdown of Mechanism (cp. *Our New Pathways in Philosophy*, Leipzig, 1929, pp. 124 ff.). In Einstein's view the new and revolutionary idea replacing the old substance-idea is the conception of the *field*. Faraday, Maxwell, and Hertz laid the foundation of a new programme of field-physics which, however, has been only partly realized owing to the impossibility of excluding the concept of matter. Out of this field-physics the problem of the theory of *relativity* arose. It is a well-known fact that in this theory a second set of absolute entities, those of absolute time and space, have been replaced by new concepts. But the interesting point is that the general theory of relativity in putting the problem of the formulation of laws which are invariant regarding all possible co-ordinate-systems, is much closer to the classical theory than seemed to be the case at the time of its first appearance. In fact the development of physics is seen here not as the destruction of one theory by another, but rather as a wider generalization embracing the earlier form. Nature is here still the unity of invariant laws which, though changing their form in different systems of co-ordinates, are nevertheless identical. Thus the concept of substance persists in the notion of absolute law. But this unity of nature and this concept of law is just what is questioned in the much more revolutionary

[1] *Physik als Abenteuer der Erkenntnis*, A. W. Sijthoff, Leiden, 1938.

quantum mechanics. The origin of two kinds of interpretations (the wave and the corpuscular interpretation), the impossibility of describing atomic individual events as objective happenings in space-time and the introduction of statistical laws are very well described. The book is very useful to the philosopher because it gives him first-hand knowledge of the essential points in modern physics, and because it enables him to see the important role of basic ideas in the building up of physical theories which are described here as free creations of the human mind.

Perhaps one could wish to hear more about the problems arising from quantum mechanics. Nevertheless, a *new stage of disharmony* is revealed full of difficult and fruitful problems which may be easily misinterpreted. It is astonishing that the physicists do not say a single word about the problem which puzzles the philosophers most, the problem of causality and quantum mechanics.

For this reason the book of E. Cassirer, *Determinism and Indeterminism in modern physics,*[1] is rather helpful. Just as he tried to show in his earlier books on *Substance and Function* and *Einstein's Theory of Relativity* that Post-Kantian physics are not incompatible with a Neo-Kantian interpretation, so he tries here to execute the corresponding task with quantum mechanics. The material of the different chapters (The Principle of Causality in Classical Physics, Causality and Probability, Causality and Quantum Mechanics . . .) is, as in all of the author's books, abundant, including critical reviews of the most important papers on the subject. Cassirer's solution is as follows. It is impossible to reconcile Kant's treatment of the law of causality as a principle of the pure understanding, or as a constitutive principle of our knowledge of nature with the conclusions of quantum mechanics. Consequently he regards this law as merely regulative, or as a "postulate of empirical thought" belonging to the sphere of "modality." As a law, no more concerning events or things but our knowledge of them, it only means that the process of transforming observed data into exact quantitative statements, and these into functional equations, and their final unification into one system of physical knowledge, is possible. The special principle of causality of quantum mechanics may be taken in Heisenberg's formulation which says that, if at any time certain physical quantities are measured as exactly as possible, then at each other time quantities exist which may be exactly measured, i.e. for which the result of measurement may be predicted in a precise manner.

It is interesting to compare C.'s results with Grete Hermann's:[2] *Concerning the basis of physical propositions in classical and modern theories.* Her view is that here, as in the theory of relativity, the old concepts are not displaced, but only their unequivocal (eindeutige) application suspended, necessitating the abandonment of an unequivocal interpretation of nature. Worth comparing are, further, the *Proceedings of the second international congress for the unity of science*[3] (Copenhagen, 1936), which was wholly devoted to the principle of causality. Here Niels Bohr develops his theory that the ideal of causality ought to be replaced by the point of view of complementality (Komplementaritaet). Perhaps still more interesting are the attempts of Martin Strauss to formulate Bohr's distinctions in form of logical syntax. He, following Wittgenstein and Carnap, tries to interpret the causal principle as a syntactical proposition regarding the logical structure of theory, and only as an indirect statement about nature. In defining complementality through a

[1] *Determinismus und Indeterminismus in der modernen Physik,* Wettergren u. Kerber, Göteborg, 1937.

[2] *Abhandlungen der Fries'schen Schule, N.F.*, vol. vi, parts 3–4, Berlin, Verlag Öffentliches Leben, 1937.

[3] *Erkenntnis*, vol. vi, parts 5–6, Meiner, Leipzig, 1937.

formula of J. v. Neumann's quantum mechanical transformation theory, he arrives at a new kind of scientific determinism. He states that the inapplicability of the classical form of causality has nothing to do with indeterminism in the usual sense of the word, but is a consequence of the complementality. Thus in a remarkable manner these interpretations, like those of Planck, Einstein, and Louis de Broglie (*Travaux du IX^e Congr. Int. d. Philos.*, Paris, 1937), come to the same negative conclusion that there is no indeterminism in physics. But the causal problem itself remains unsolved and complicated. It demands probably more than a mere formal transformation of the principle of causality, namely, a change of our epistemological attitude towards nature, and probably a change of logic also. The principle of causality, even if merely regulative, cannot be a modal principle (because the problems of possibility, reality, and necessity are specific and not to be identified with the problem of reason). On the other hand, it loses its specific meaning if identified with the tendency towards a systematic unity of our knowledge. Real problems are not solved if they are replaced by others (thus Mach did not give a solution by replacing *causality* by *function*). The problem of causality cannot be solved if not taken as part of the wider problem of "reason" (Grund), and without distinguishing different meanings of reason. The confusion of the problem regarding quantum mechanics seems to arise from the fact that two different meanings of reason, *ratio essendi* and *ratio cognoscendi* are not distinguished. That we are not able to follow the fate of a single atom or determine at the same time its space-time and velocity only means that we arrive at the limit of the method of *ratio cognoscendi*, and that if we try to describe this sphere in terms of the concepts of macro-physics we are mistaken. But it does not mean that there is no *ratio essendi* of any kind. The philosophically most important consequences of this theory are the demands for a transformation of our concept of the law of nature and of logic. I may perhaps draw the attention of the reader to a paper of Gonseth on the law of nature and to another one of Zygmunt Zawirski, who tries to apply in an interesting manner Lukasiewicz's logic of more than two values (mehrwertige Logik) to the problem concerned (both in *Erkenntnis*, vol. vi).

Alwin Mittasch's book on *Catalysis and Determinism*[1] leads into a different, but still cognate, field, namely, into the philosophy of chemistry. Causality figures again as the central problem. His general thesis is that causality as a form of synthetic order of our impressions after the principle of cause and effect assumes different forms corresponding to various levels of being. M. distinguishes a material causality of preservation (E.K.), an impulse causality (Anstoss-Kausalität; A.K., a causality initiating certain evolutions), the physiological—biological stimulus—causality (R.K.), the totality-causality likewise biological (G.K.), the psycho-physical and psychical causality (S.K.), all of which are embraced in a universal causality with plan and aim (N.K.). His special thesis is that chemical catalysis is a special kind of impulse-causality. This general scheme, I admit, is very rough, but nevertheless not without interest. His chief idea that we must formulate the principle of causality in a different manner according to different objects is not new, it is the central idea of Schopenhauer's important essay *On the fourfold root of the principle of sufficient reason*. It is moreover the basis of Aristotle's distinction of the different meanings of *αἰτία*. New only is its application to the present stage of science. But it is not worth while to explain his distinctions because they are not exact enough.

The most interesting part is that on catalysis, because Mittasch is an authority on this subject, and has published several books and papers on

[1] *Katalyse und Determinismus*, Springer, Berlin, 1938.

catalysis in chemistry and biology. It is astonishing that the phenomenon itself is ambiguous. We often hear, say: Do not interpret, describe, and explain. Dilthey even believed the methods of natural science to be description and explanation, that of history interpretation. Now Berzelius sees the chief characteristic of a catalyser in its causing chemical processes which would not occur without it, others see it in its exercising an accelerating influence. M. introduces a new point of view defining catalysers as determining direction and velocity of chemical reactions (he means by direction the choice of a specific reaction).

This definition or this interpretation of the phenomenon induces M. to introduce a new kind of *catalytic causality*. I discuss only this point, which is of some philosophical importance, recommending the pages on the different kinds of catalysis, and on the special form of its reaction to the especially interested reader. M. believes chemical causality to be a typical preservation-causality finding its complement in the catalytic impulse-causality. Now, I am afraid, I must disappoint the author. For he does not see that every kind of so-called "forces" in influencing any system determines its direction and velocity, or better, acceleration. It is highly superfluous to introduce any "directing forces" (vis directivae) into the explanation of nature because every one of the so-called forces is in itself directional. Thus magnetic, gravitational, electric "forces," etc., always determine direction. (This is, by the way, one of the strongest arguments against the introduction of teleological causes into the interpretation of inorganic or organic nature.) Granted that M.'s description and definition be right (a description which we, being no specialists in this subject, are unable to judge), it would be quite as sensible to introduce a causality of magnetism, gravitation, electricity, etc. But that would be senseless. *Scientiae non sunt augmentandae praeter necessitatem.*

If thus the general thesis of the book lacks precision and the special thesis is mistaken, the book nevertheless, through the analysis of catalysis, has value as one of the rare papers on the philosophy of chemistry written by authorities on chemistry.

Going on we note that the present situation of *Philosophy of Organic Nature* falls somewhere between philosophy of physics and philosophy of history. On the one hand, older theories and concepts have to be overcome as in physics, and on the other hand new concepts must be introduced as in history. Kurt Goldstein's book *The Structure of the Organism*[1] is important because the author develops the first *biological Gestalt-theory* without identifying himself with the psychological Gestalt-theory with which, however, he is closely connected.

The author is a neurologist, formerly Professor at Frankfurt and Berlin, now in New York, and has had great experience of brain lesions. His theory of the organism is unique in being mainly based on these experiences. This is its strength as well as its weakness. It would be fair to characterize this biology as totalitarian (Ganzheitsbiologie), and there is more than a mere external relation between the totalitarian tendencies in biology and in politics. His chief idea (corresponding in a certain respect to the tendencies of Holism and Organicism in this country) is that every reaction of the organism is a reaction of the *whole* body, and not only of a part of it. Therefore he opposes absolutely any attempt to build up the organism out of single reflexes or out of any parts.

This reacting organism follows a biological law which is a formal principle of reaction: it is only because every change caused through the stimuli of the outer world is in "adequate" time reduced to an "adequate" mean level

[1] *Der Aufbau des Organismus*, Nijhoff, Haag, 1934.

that it preserves its formal chief character, its relative constancy which is a guarantee for its existence as well as for its recognizability (p. 349). This law (in which "adequate" means as much as "natural to this specific organism") implies more than it seems to imply at first sight, namely, (1) the principle of least action which I believe is of great importance in organic nature (meaning in this case that every change is readjusted in the simplest economical manner), (2) the law of compensation (that every disturbance of organic balance is followed by a return to it), (3) the idea that the constancy of an organism is based on an equilibrium natural to this specific being, and on a natural tendency towards it (cp. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Nervenheilkunde*, Leipzig, 1929, vol. 109, pp. 1 ff.).

Thus this theory is a kind of *reactive* theory of life. It does not start from the organism as acting, but as reacting body. It believes that to the basic law corresponds a basic biological process and a basic biological function the same throughout the whole nervous system and probably the whole organism. Consequently its chief distinctions are an organism reacting in the right manner (reacting adequately), or in a wrong manner (catastrophically), or generally "to be in order" and "to be in disorder." The development of the organism may therefore be described as passing from order to order, or from catastrophe to catastrophe (I wonder what a violet may think about this description of its life). If we restrict the author's descriptions to the human organism we find interesting remarks about the change of the function of the organism through lesion. Illness arises if an organism is changed in such a way that it reacts catastrophically in its normal surroundings. This book deserves the attention of all interested in the Philosophy of the Organism, because, written by a biologist of high philosophical culture, it contains much first-hand observation and formulation of biological facts, and, e.g., a new theory of the nervous system, and because it sees biological and psychological phenomena in their interconnection (an attitude as necessary as rare among biologists). It is even interesting in its errors (e.g. in the thesis that being is always positive, that nature does not know negative elements; I leave it to the reader to explain why a statement of this kind is meaningless). But it gives only one side of the picture; the reactive conception of life must be completed by an active one. And notwithstanding the protest of the author, analysis and synthesis are always connected, and the transition from the whole to the parts is only the one side which again must be completed through the transition from the parts to the whole. After all, every great progress in natural science has been linked up with the discovery of basic elements. Whether this basic element of biology has already been found in the author's arch-enemy, the reflex, the future will decide. The Gestalt-school is right in denying the organism to be a mere aggregate of parts, but it may be an integration. Probably biological integration and differentiation will be found one day to be as intimately connected as they are in mathematics.

It may be relevant to add some remarks on books related to the history of the subject. Worth mentioning is the *Bibliographia Kepleriana*,[1] because it is a comprehensive bibliography of Kepler, and because to every really penetrating historical study a good bibliography is the first presupposition. The drawback of this book is that it is more and less than a real bibliography. It is more in so far as it adds explanatory remarks about the content of the books and their relation to Kepler's life. These remarks are surely useful to many readers, but are of course restricted in length, and cannot contain a thorough analysis. It gives more by adding facsimiles of the titles of the first editions; they are very nice to look at, useful perhaps to librarians, but not

[1] *Verlag*, C. H. Beck, München, 1936.

necessary. Finally, the libraries are added which possess these editions, but the list is incomplete, omitting, among others, the English libraries. The Bodleian, e.g., possesses the pamphlet No. 36 on the four Satellites of Jupiter, together with the dissertation "De Nuncio Sidereo," and with the wonderful motto of Alcinous: He has to be free in his mind who wishes to philosophize. Consequently all the conclusions drawn on p. 60 from the non-existence of this edition are without foundation. The work is less than a bibliography by giving nearly always the generally very long titles in abridged form, and thus omitting sometimes very interesting details, and chiefly by omitting the Manuscript-remains which here (like in many other cases) are indispensable. It is now one of the jokes of history that the bulk of Kepler's MSS.-remains was bought on the advice of L. Euler by the Empress Catherine of Russia, and is in the library of the observatory of Pulkowo. Whereas the last monumental edition of E. Ch. Frisch brought much new material from these sources, the unpublished material of this new bibliography is very scarce, consisting of a catalogue in Kepler's own hand (1622), which, however, is incomplete. The value of the new edition of Kepler's works, of which already one volume has been published, about which we are unable to judge because we have not seen it, depends entirely on the question whether these MSS. are at the disposal of the editors or not. If not, I am afraid, this new edition cannot be a definitive one, and may be an improvement upon the last great edition, and upon the new material published in the meantime, only in minor points. Here, as in every kind of scientific work, the principle must be: all or nothing.

Of minor importance is a small book of Anneliese Maier about *Mechanism in the Seventeenth Century*,[1] trying to show how complicated and how strongly its development was influenced by speculation. She treats of Gassendi, Galileo, Digby, Hobbes, Descartes, Malebranche, Huyghens, Newton, Leibniz, Boyle, and Locke. If this paper leads back to an interpretation which is definitely ruled out by the development of physics, R. Hönigswald's more important study of the *Thinkers of the Italian Renaissance*[2] goes back to a still earlier stage of modern Philosophy of Nature, although it takes it merely as part of the universal philosophy of the Renaissance. This he believes concentrates on three central ideas: method, historical source, and personality. The concentration on problems is an advantage for the analysis of the problems, but a disadvantage for the understanding of persons. To label, e.g., Leonardo as Platonist does not, I am afraid, do justice to his originality (cp. our *Leonardo's theory of the visible world*, Revue philosophique, 1936).

We conclude with a short remark on Heinrich Scholz, *History of Logic*.[3] The importance of Scholz is that he maintains the tradition of symbolic logic in Germany. He publishes in the above-named Proceedings of the Fries School an interesting article on *Bolzano's Theory of Science*. Not only this article, but Bolzano himself deserves the study of all serious students of logic. The short history of logic is valuable because, from the point of view of symbolic logic, it throws new light on the historical development of logic, and contains some interesting historical remarks and bibliographical notes. On the whole, the reader would wish to see more facts and fewer judgments; even the symbolic logic is here defended rather than expounded.

Thus the whole field of Philosophy of Nature (including physics, chemistry, biology) and its relations to epistemology and logic is full of problems which cannot be without influence on the further development of philosophy. If anyone should ask us to characterize the present relation of philosophy to

[1] *Die Mechanisierung des Weltbilds im 17, Jahrhundert*, Meiner, Leizig, 1938.
[2] *Denker der italienischen Renaissance*, Haus zum Falken, Basel, 1938.
[3] *Geschichte der Logik*, Junker und Duennhaupt, Berlin.

nature in one word, I believe it must be the same as that which characterizes physics of to-day: disharmony; whereas the corresponding relation in the cases of Galileo, Descartes, Leibniz, Kant, who themselves were in one person philosophers and scientists, was harmony. To them nature as well as science of nature was *one*; the law of continuity established in Leibniz's system the harmony of the universe. No gulf existed between the human understanding and nature. That now all this is changed is by no means chance. For philosophy is an expression of man, and the relation of philosophy to nature is based on the relation of man to nature. Yet in the development of modern thought man lost first God, then Man, and finally Nature. Proceeding from discovery to discovery, he is left with nothing but a system of highly developed empty symbols which, he is now told, do not reveal to him anything about nature, but only about his knowledge, or even his mere language about nature.

Therefore to-day's philosophy of nature expresses either the loss of nature and its unity, or the desire to regain it; and the trend of thought, not openly confessed but secretly felt, is: *à la recherche de la nature perdue.*

F. H. Heinemann.

NEW BOOKS

Critical Realism: Studies in the Philosophy of Mind and Nature. By G. Dawes Hicks. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Pp. xxiv + 346. Price 15s. net.)

When a Briton or an American speaks nowadays of philosophical "realism" he refers principally and usually to the philosophies that Moore's *Refutation of Idealism* and the *New Realism* of the American sextet did so much to stimulate if not even to inaugurate in the early years of the present century. This tendency may conceal the fact that there had been a persistent realistic trend in European philosophy in the later nineteenth century, despite the general dominance of opposing theories, and that the movement was British as well as continental. Men like Adamson and Hobhouse sponsored it; and, especially from Adamson's pen, it was "critical" in the historical as well as in the obvious sense. In other words, it was prepared to follow (although it was anxious to amend) the Kantian tradition, and was not like McTaggart (despite his Hegelianism), Moore, Russell, or Whitehead, deliberately "pre-critical" in its outlook.

In his modest introduction, Mr. Dawes Hicks claims affiliation with this movement. I would not wrong him if I called him a second Adamson, unless the statement was carelessly supposed to mean that he set to work in leading-strings. That is certainly not the case. His work is most definitely his own, and if it is "critical" both in the historical and in the obvious sense, the reason is that the author has come to adopt that attitude after prolonged and very extensive as well as very precise acquaintance with the major philosophies of many epochs and cultures. He is "critical" by conviction—a learned Kantian in no danger of becoming water-logged in the marshes of East Prussia, willing and eager to navigate his critical realism in the tricky currents of the present age. Incidentally he had anticipated the American "critical realists" in his choice of that title, and his attitude in philosophy is quite distinct from theirs.

For many years now, Mr. Dawes Hicks has developed his philosophy and epistemology in occasional papers dealing with their salient themes, and has shown the greatest care as well as an almost inexhaustible patience at each step in his task. A selection of these papers is printed here together with an introduction, and one paper hitherto unpublished. In the result we have what is very nearly a systematic treatise on epistemology, and very definitely, a unified exposition. The catena of essays (whose original dates of publication extended from 1916 to 1934) has not required much alteration and treats systematically of perception, imagination, conception, matter, force, and nature, sometimes through the criticism of others, sometimes by the most direct methods. It is to be regretted, I think, that the book does not contain an independent essay upon the nature of mind, for Mr. Dawes Hicks has written on that subject too, and it is a subject that (naturally) pervades his epistemology. His explicit treatment of this general subject, in the present volume, however, is principally to be found in the brief statements of § 7 of Essay IX (Essay IX, as a whole, hardly suffices, being a polemic against Mr. Broad's theory of a "psychic factor"). Apart from this disappointment, how-

ever, there is little to diminish our satisfaction with the solidity and the cumulative impressiveness of these essays. Essay XI (on Meinong), it is true, stands a little apart from the rest; but it is a very valuable exposition of Meinong's epistemology. The concluding essay (XII) comparing Spinoza with Leibniz may reasonably be regarded as an epilogue concerning natural theology—an appropriate culmination for any serious philosophy.

As I have said, Mr. Dawes Hicks's methods are frequently direct although sometimes he prefers to proceed less directly through the criticism of others. I shall not here say very much about his employment of the more indirect method (e.g. his essays upon Bradley's and Eddington's account of "nature," or upon Mr. Stace's subjectivism), except to remark that few contemporary writers show an equal mastery of theories they oppose or are equally successful in achieving the reality as well as the appearance of fairness. I shall, however, attempt to make some brief observations upon Mr. Dawes Hicks's epistemology and upon some of its distinctions from other types of "realism" or of what is commonly accounted such.

As it seems to me, Mr. Dawes Hicks is so far Kantian that he believes that our acquaintance with reality must always be sensori-conceptual, and also that the principal task of epistemology is to analyse what is meant by the awareness of an "object." He is not a Kantian in so far as Kantianism lends support to the caricature that an "object" is a manufactured article composed of "given" sense-elements stuck together with transcendental glue. "Sensa" (so-called) are, for him, not *given* objects and, indeed, are not objects at all. None of them is an *etwas* to which thought may be *gerichtet*. For him they are not even entities that should be called "appearances" but the "ways in which a thing is apprehended" (p. 29).

On this cardinal point Mr. Dawes Hicks is emphatically at odds with the Cambridge realists or quasi-realists (supposing the appellation to be approximately correct). It seems clear that he may be right. It need not be supposed, e.g., that the limits of observation, in any given instance, impose an objective boundary, and when Mr. Dawes Hicks follows Ward in his general analysis of the perceptual situation and maintains that perception is best described as a process of discrimination capable of improvement (that is to say, capable of nicer discrimination) there are many who would agree with him and so would deny that each refinement in discerning implies the emergence of a new natural *etwas*, a "sensum." They would allow, in short, that some reputed "objects" are not objects; but they might want to know rather more about what an object *is*. According to Ward "the presentational continuum" formed the *totum objectivum* within which the discrimination took place. Such, as I gather, is not Mr. Dawes Hicks's view. He believes in dynamic substances, but his repeated exposition of a Wardian analysis of the process of perception (both he and Ward being neo-Kantians of a kind) does not (I think) carry him very far; and a "way" of manifestation is not very explicit. It reminds me uncomfortably of the Humian (and Cartesian) term a "manner"—not very different from a *je ne sais quoi*. I should like to see a definition of a "way."

Another respect in which Mr. Dawes Hicks differs from many contemporary "realists" or quasi-realists is his free and habitual use of the term "content" in his epistemological analysis. He believes *ex animo* in "contents" with regard to perception, imagery, and conception, and he sprinkles his pages liberally with the term. This pervasive use of the term on his part prevents one's comments upon it from being merely fussy, or from descending to paltry incidentals.

There are, it appears (p. 92) no less than three distinct sets of "contents"

required in epistemological analysis. On the side of the object there are the "content" of the object and the "content apprehended." On the side of the subject there is the "content of the mental act." Let us call these "contents," A-contents, B-contents, and C-contents respectively.

The A-content of an object, one learns, is the sum of that object's characteristics (p. 94). Its B-content is the sum of its *apprehended* characteristics by any given mind in any given act of awareness. So far the distinction (error apart) is very clear. What is not plain is why the word "content" should be used at all. It is unnatural to say that an old curtain "contains" dinginess, let us say. But it is clear enough that unless a man's attention exhausts the "object" that confronts him, it will select from that "object." Therefore the *noticed* characteristics of the object will be less than *all* its characteristics. It is also clear, however, that B-contents, although they need not be mental things, or a sort of mental screen between minds and things, are mentally circumscribed in all cases in which they do not coincide with A-contents. Hence it is quintessential to distinguish them sharply from C-contents; and that is (if possible) the more necessary because it is usual to regard "blue" "equal" and the like (i.e. "sensations" and "universals") as *mental* contents, which is precisely what Mr. Dawes Hicks wants most strenuously to deny.

According to Mr. Dawes Hicks, C-contents are the characteristics of the act of awareness. Again I do not see why the word "content" should be used at all. It seems to me to be unnecessary and also misleading, since it is the legatee of a philosophy that Mr. Dawes Hicks believes to be void. Moreover, since self-acquaintance is a note of mental acts (according to our author) and may be more or less explicit (according to any one who admits its existence) it would seem that we ought to distinguish between *all* the characteristics of the act of awareness and those that, at any given time, are reflexively prominent. If so, we ought to have D-contents as well as C-contents. But let that pass. Epistemology must become very treacherous indeed, if it does not display a warning signal whenever C-contents are at all likely to be confused with B-contents.

Mr. Dawes Hicks, for the most part, very definitely avoids such a confusion, but I think that his readers may find the point confusing; and I know that I do. Moreover, it does not seem to me that his own doctrine is invariably free from this confusion, although I hope that this impression is due to my own obtuseness. Thus he tells us (p. 106) that when people think they can recall music in the stillness of their homes after returning from a concert, "I surmise that what they are in truth reproducing are the contents of their perceptive acts whilst in the concert hall, and the imagery that results may well cluster round some nucleus of perceived fact." Now Mr. Dawes Hicks is very emphatic in holding that the act of perceiving blue is not blue, or the act of perceiving a sound sonorous (p. 41). But the images that appear after the concert surely *resemble* the sounds heard at the concert, that is, have similar characteristics. If then the C-contents (i.e. the characteristics) of the mental acts are quite dissimilar from the B-contents at the concert, how can the illusion occur? If images "cluster round" perceived fact are not such images B-contents of the apparent situation? Are they not "ways" in which the situation is apprehended? (It is, in fact, very difficult to deny that an image *is* an *etwas* to which attention may be *gerichtet*.) The same difficulty, as it seems to me, clings to a part of Mr. Dawes Hicks's exposition of "Conceptual thought and real existence." He distinguishes clearly between the concept and the universal. The universal is an A-content, but he says (p. 135) "A concept is a *way* in which a universal is conceived [italics mine], a *mode* in which it is grasped by

thought, or in other words a content apprehended (corresponding to the so-called 'presentation' or 'appearance' in sense-perception)." It is therefore a B-content and we are warned on the preceding page that it is not a C-content (which is "a mental state of conceiving"). Nevertheless, we are also told (p. 135) that a concept is a "product of thought." Therefore that which has C-contents can *produce* that which has B-contents. This seems to me to be very odd. For B-contents (be it remembered) are characteristics of the object, just as much as A-contents are. They are a selection from the totality of A-contents (i.e. characteristics). Since a universal, *ex hypothesi*, may be the whole A-content in the case, there need be no room for the distinction between A-contents and B-contents. In that case, therefore, the concept and the universal should coincide, and mental acts would produce A-content.

I have no space for further comments on a scale proportionate to work of this high quality. In a cursory way, however, I should like to commend the essay on "The dynamic aspect of nature" to the reader's careful attention. I have to confess that I find this essay more illuminating regarding the arguments that should be avoided in this connection (by psychologists, physicists, and philosophers) than in its positive pronouncements on what force and cohesion in nature actually are; but the negative paths are badly in need of lighting, and when they are lit the truth may be rolling about at our feet. As I have said, I should like to have seen an independent essay, or several independent essays, upon the nature of the human mind. It seems to me that the doctrine of "contents" on p. 241 might give way under pressure, and that many of Mr. Dawes Hicks's emphatic assertions about our knowledge of the characteristics of mental acts are dubiously consistent with what seems to me to be the Kantianism of his philosophy of the mind itself. But to ask for more in this way is liker sheer greed than a justifiable complaint against lenten fare at the wrong time of year.

JOHN LAIRD.

The Degrees of Knowledge. By JACQUES MARITAIN. Translated from the second revised and augmented French edition by Bernard Wall and Margot R. Adamson. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1938. Pp. xviii + 475. Price $6.00.)

An English translation of M. Maritain's chief work on Epistemology is eminently desirable, and we wish that the volume before us met the need. We are not here concerned with the masterly and subtle, perhaps over-subtle, adaptation of St. Thomas's philosophy to the vastly increased store of knowledge available to the world to-day, that forms the theme of *Les degrés de Savoir*; nor with the interest that M. Maritain's learned and exhaustive study is bound to excite in the thinking public. His work has been accessible in French for several years, and has roused deserved attention, especially by its handling of the Thomistic theory of knowledge in relation to contemporary mathematical and physical advances and by its penetrating analysis of Christian mystical experience. Our business is solely with the adequacy of this translation. M. Maritain is not an easy writer, even when we read him in the original. The difficulties arising from the nature of his subject are increased by his coinage of a peculiar terminology (e.g. *intellection ananoétique, dianoétique, perinoétique*) and by his complex and lengthy sentences. We are not complaining of M. Maritain; he is well within his rights, and he never uses hard words without giving an explanation of their meaning. But

these idiosyncrasies of style and presentment make his book hard to translate; and a translation that heightens the difficulty of the original is of little service to the English reader. We wish we could recommend the present version, but to do so is beyond the scope of our charity. The translators have made a gallant effort to achieve what is wellnigh impossible, i.e. to follow M. Maritain's sentences literally, preserving the punctuation and structure of the original without modification. The result is that their version is artificial and obscure. What is worse is that it is by no means accurate, especially in the more difficult chapters, such as those on "Critical Realism" and "Metaphysical Knowledge." We have been at pains to compare the translation with the original. Take the following example (*E.T.* 113, *Fr.* 181–182).

"I shall therefore say, bowing down in my turn before the jargon of pedantry, that as the object is correlative to a knowing subject, to an ontological 'for itself' to which it corresponds, which by reflection on its acts of thought perceives immediately, not, as Descartes thought, its rightful essence, but the fact of its rightful existence, and which we may call the *cis-objective subject*, it is also, not correlative to, but inseparable from (because it is itself) an ontological 'for itself' which precisely takes on the name of the object in so far as it is present to thought, and which we may call the *objectiviable* (!) or *transobjective subject*, not certainly inasmuch as it is hidden behind the object, but, on the contrary, in the degree to which it is itself grasped as object, and that (!!) it nevertheless constitutes an irreducible in which the possibility of new objects to be grasped remain always open (for it can give rise to an indefinite sequence of necessary and contingent truths).

Here is the original:

"Nous dirons donc, en nous prévalant á notre tour du jargon de la pédanterie, que comme l'objet est corrélatif d'un sujet connaissant, d'un 'pour soi' ontologique auquel il fait face et qui par réflexion sur ses actes de pensée perçoit immédiatement non pas sa propre essence, ainsi que le croyait Descartes, mais le fait de sa propre existence, et que nous pouvons appeler *sujet cis-objectif*, il est aussi, non pas corrélatif, mais inséparable (parce que c'est lui-même) d'un 'pour soi' ontologique qui prend précisément le nom d'un objet en tant qu'il est présenté à la pensée, et que nous pouvons appeler *sujet objectivable* ou sujet *transobjectif*, non pas certes en tant qu'il serait caché derrière l'objet, mais au contraire en tant qu'il est saisi lui-même comme l'objet, et qu'il constitue cependant un irréductible en lequel la possibilité de nouveaux objets á saisir demeure toujours ouverte (car il peut donner lieu á une suite indéfinie de vérités nécessaires ou contingentes)."

Of course, it is not all so bad as this, though we could cite many more examples from these two chapters where confusion has been worse confounded by the translators. The closing chapters on mysticism, on the other hand, are more competently rendered. But is it pardonable to perpetrate such inaccuracies as "Melissa" for "Melisse," "pseudo-Dionysus" for "pseudo-Denys," the wrong initials for Dr. Whitehead (when the original gives no initials), or such a monstrosity as "Spinozianism"? Moreover, the punctuation needs revision throughout. M. Maritain gives at least an index of proper names; the translators give none. These delinquencies and drawbacks are serious. We are almost persuaded that it would take the English or American reader less time to learn French and to read M. Maritain in the original than to grasp the more difficult (which are also the more important) parts of this version. It would also cost less to his pocket.

W. G. DE BURGH.

The Principles of Human Knowledge. By GEORGE BERKELEY. Edited, with an Analysis and Appendix, by T. E. JESSOP, M.A., B.Litt., Professor of Philosophy in the University College of Hull. (London: A. Brown & Sons, Ltd. 1937. Pp. xix + 148. Price 2s. 6d. net.)

Professor Jessop has performed a very useful task in producing this critical edition of Berkeley's *Principles* at a price within the range of every student.

In this edition Professor Jessop has departed from the practice of all previous editors. He has printed in full the text of the first edition, and has noted the variants in the second in such a way that they may be easily and yet exhaustively studied by reading the footnotes in thick type and by observing the thick brackets, indicating omissions, in the main body of the text.

In addition, Professor Jessop has indicated the respects in which the text of the first edition departs from a manuscript in Berkeley's hand of sections 85–145 now in the British Museum. This manuscript has not before been utilized.

Some doubt may be felt as to whether Professor Jessop was well inspired to print the text of the first edition rather than the second. The second edition contains the text which Berkeley, after mature reflection, wished to go down to posterity. From the point of view also of a study of the development of his thought, it might have been clearer to have printed this text, noting the variants in the two anterior texts, namely those of the manuscript and of the first edition. The matter is not, however, of great importance. What is important is that the variants should be clearly indicated; and this has been admirably done by Professor Jessop.

The variants in the texts fall into two main categories. Into the first category fall the variants of style or form. For example, in the second edition Berkeley consistently cuts out the term "etc.," which frequently occurs in the first edition. He either deletes it altogether or replaces it by some phrase such as, "and so forth."

The second class of variant includes those of philosophic importance. An extremely interesting result of Professor Jessop's collation of the British Museum manuscript appears in section 140. This is the much-quoted section which begins (in the first edition): "In a large sense, indeed, we may be said to have an idea of spirit." In the second edition the words "or rather a notion" are added after "idea." Now Professor Jessop points out that in the manuscript the whole of section 140 is written on the facing page reserved for additions and corrections, and that the words "or rather a notion" were written in the manuscript but crossed out. This discovery supplies a further argument against the theory, never very soundly based, that Berkeley's doctrine of notions was a late development.

In the Appendix to the volume are printed two letters of 1729 and 1730 from the Rev. Samuel Johnson to Berkeley. They are interesting as containing the earliest known criticism of any length and weight of Berkeley's theory.

G. A. JOHNSTON.

Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society. New series, vol. xxxvii. Containing the Papers read before the Society during the Fifty-eighth Session, 1936–1937. (London: Harrison & Sons. 1937. Pp. 246. Price 25s.)

Knowledge and Foreknowledge. The Symposia read at the Joint Session of the Aristotelian Society and the Mind Association at the University, Bristol, July 9–11, 1937. Aristotelian Society supplementary volume xvi. (London: Harrison & Sons. 1937. Pp. 243. Price 15s.)

From a series of *Aristotelian Society Proceedings* extending over a number of years it should be possible to estimate philosophical tendencies; but the contents of a single volume must be determined by so many accidents—whom could the Secretary find who had not read a paper recently, who was willing to read one this year, and so forth—that a review can hardly be more than a roughly classified catalogue.

Professor Alexander's presidential address ("Form and Subject-Matter in Art") was postponed to the middle of the 1936–37 session, his place at the opening meeting being taken by Professor de Burgh ("The Idea of a Religious Philosophy"). But both these distinguished authors are confessedly only repeating, with some additions, what they have said at much greater length elsewhere, so it is no disparagement of either of them to say that the paper of the year is Mr. John Wisdom's "Philosophical Perplexity." The importance of this is that it represents the first appearance in print of the developed philosophy of Wittgenstein. It is true that Mr. Wisdom cautions his readers "against supposing it a closer imitation of Wittgenstein than it is"—certainly at best it is only Wittgenstein at second-hand; but the fact remains that, until Wittgenstein publishes something himself, this is as near as anyone can get who is not of the inner circle of disciples, or in personal contact with them, or able to beg, borrow, or steal a copy of one of the "coloured books" which are circulating in manuscript. The paper cannot be summarized—it must be read. It may be added that it is very amusing.

After this perhaps the most significant contribution is Professor Levy's "Causality and Determinism"—not, however, for its own sake (for Professor Levy, too, has expressed himself at greater length elsewhere), but as representing one more stage in the gradual acceptance of Dialectical Materialism in academic philosophical circles. (Tendencies outside philosophical lecture-rooms already suggest that this may well become the fashionable philosophy of the nineteen-forties, as Logical Positivism has been that of the nineteen-thirties.) Here the doctrine is applied specifically to physical science. Covering much the same ground, but from the standpoint of the "pure" scientific worker, Dr. Jeffreys ("Scientific Method, Causality and Reality") argues that "scientific progress does not depend on exactness"; a hypothesis is established when, applying the theory of probability, "we get a better fit than we should expect if the observations were distributed at random." To the casual reader both these papers may well prove barely intelligible, for Dr. Jeffreys takes for granted an acquaintance with technical terms of mathematics (particularly the term "parameter"), while Professor Levy uses important terms (such as "quality" and "dialectical change") in senses quite unfamiliar to the non-Marxian philosopher, with no, or very inadequate, explanation.

Papers by Mr. Mace ("Physicalism"), Mr. Ayer ("Verification and Experience"), and Mr. I. Gallie ("Mental Facts") may perhaps be treated as thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, though the Physicalism which Mr. Ayer attacks is a much more full-blooded affair than that which Mr. Mace defends, and Mr. Gallie only concludes very half-heartedly that the case *against* a modified Physicalism (or as he prefers to call it "neutralism") is *not proven*.

There are no less than four ethical papers, if we include Professor Jessop's "Evaluation, Causality, and Freedom," which, though it deals with knowledge rather than action, treats knowledge ethically, as involving "evaluation"; (the conclusion drawn is that knowledge cannot be regarded merely as a special case of causation). Of these the most ambitious is Professor Campbell's "Prolegomena to a Theory of the Moral Criterion," designed to show that the moral worth of conduct cannot be judged by its approximation to any concrete standard, but "solely on the basis of the internal determination involved," which ends in a discussion of the nature of responsibility. This last question is then taken up and discussed by Mr. A. K. Stout ("Free Will and Responsibility"), but without coming to any very surprising or unorthodox conclusions. Mr. Whiteley ("Goodness of Motives") defends against objections the commonsense view that motives (and not only actions) may be intrinsically (and not only instrumentally) good or bad.

Political philosophy is represented only by Professor Langley's "Freedom and Modern Political Conceptions," in which the scales are held so evenly between the Corporate States, Communism, and Liberal Democracy as to leave the unfortunate impression at the end that nothing decisive has been said.

The 1937 Joint Session at Bristol produced three symposia and two addresses. For his presidential address Professor Field chose a refreshingly new subject —"The Teaching of Philosophy." It is a pity, however, that this could not be a symposium. The question of the function of a Philosophy Department is one that must interest all teachers of philosophy, especially in the modern universities, and, instructive though Professor Field's views are, it would have been even more instructive to see how far others of equal experience agreed or disagreed with him.

The first symposium is concerned with "Induction and Hypothesis." Miss MacDonald, who opens it, takes the question to be whether induction requires justification, i.e. whether, having made a prediction in accordance with our best inductive methods, we can still ask whether (and if so how) we *know* that it will come true. Her answer seems to be that the question is absurd and due to linguistic confusion; the word "know" has several different uses in English, but, when we say that we "know" that something will happen, we just *mean* that it is the conclusion yielded by our inductive methods. Both the other contributions are parallel replies to Miss MacDonald; but Mr. Ryle devotes most of his space to an interesting distinction of three senses of "probability" (which he calls "plausibility," "numerical odds," and "inductive reliability") and discussion of the relations between them. Mr. Berlin, in a very long paper, concludes that we can describe kinds of universe in which induction would be possible and impossible, but cannot by rational means decide of which kind this actual universe is.

Both the other symposia are disappointing. The question set for the second was "Is there an absolute good?", but none of the three symposiasts seems to have been quite certain what this meant. Professor de Burgh holds that there *is* an absolute good, namely God, but that this can be known only by religious faith, but assumes that the question for discussion is whether the existence of such a good can be proved by philosophical (i.e. metaphysical or ethical) arguments. Professor Laird thinks that there is an intelligible and legitimate sense in which any *intrinsic* good could be called an "absolute" good, defining an intrinsic good as "one which is good in itself irrespective of the rest of the universe," and takes the question to be whether there is only *one* such good. Finally, Professor Campbell takes an absolute good to be one which "comprises all value within itself," and then divides moralists into Objectivists and

Subjectivists, for the first of whom the question takes the form, "Can we conceive a state of affairs in which all intrinsic goods co-exist, each in its utmost degree of perfection?" and for the second the form, "Is there any conceivable state of affairs which would yield a complete and lasting satisfaction of the human self?" But all three, however they understand the question, answer it in the negative.

For the third symposium the question set was, "Does philosophy analyse common sense?" But Mr. Duncan-Jones, who opens it, deals in fact with the quite different question, "What is it that the kind of philosophy which professes to analyse common sense actually does?" He leaves the impression of an honest but puzzled mind, raising many questions, but not finding them so easy to answer to his own satisfaction. Mr. Ayer, who is the only other symposiast, confines himself for the most part to one of Mr. Duncan-Jones's questions—whether the analysis of a common-sense proposition can be described as explaining what everybody means by it—or, as he himself otherwise puts it, the question how analytical philosophy can be distinguished from lexicography. The answer he suggests is that the difference is in the purpose and effect, rather than in the nature, of the activity; analytical philosophy is explanation of the proper use of words, but only of such as may encourage us to draw false inferences, ask spurious questions, or make nonsensical assumptions.

At the final sitting Professor Broad gave an address on "The Philosophical Implications of Foreknowledge." This, too, is very disappointing. Its purpose is to show that the occurrence of supernormal precognition involves no logical or metaphysical impossibility, so that the question whether it occurs or not is a purely empirical one. But few who find this difficult will feel that their difficulties have even been seriously met, far less resolved. Perhaps the most interesting thing about it is that the conclusion of Professor Broad's own well-known discussion (in *Scientific Thought*) of the reality of the future is now given up, though without any indication what fault the author now finds in the argument.

A. M. MacIver.

A Philosophy for a Modern Man. By Prof. H. Levy. (London: V. Gollancz, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 287. Price 7s. 6d.)

Professor Levy's book is composed not of philosophy in any strict sense of the word, but of a curious amalgam of economics, politics, history, mathematics, physics, sociology, and metaphysics, the whole being precipitated round a core of solid Marxist dogma, which forms at once the basis and the background of Professor Levy's thought. The book is written in an arid and abstract style, as arid and abstract as that of Marx himself—the following is a fair sample: "The succession of class societies that has culminated in the present capitalist phase must first be regarded as a group, a very large scale statistical historical isolate, each atomic element of which was itself a phase of the whole succession. The development within the whole group has been of a straight-line statistical nature, successive phases replacing the previous, but still manifesting in each an internal class structure"—and Professor Levy continuously makes use of expressions such as "social dynamics," whose meaning is taken for granted, but never explained.

Philosophy, as Professor Levy understands it, has a practical aim. It should, he holds, "illuminate the practice of ordinary life." Should the question of a philosophy's truth be raised, then its claim to be true must "stand

or fall by its active meaning for man." But it is not enough that a philosophy should be true; it is not even enough that it should illuminate man's practice, it must also improve his world. For—and here we come to the distinctive claim which Professor Levy makes for philosophy—a philosophy, "if it is to be a real living guide to man, must illumine the part he has to play in re-shaping the world so that his ideals may be finally achieved."

This brings me to that insistence upon the complementary character of theory and practice, which forms one of the distinctive features of Professor Levy's (and Marx's) philosophy. "All philosophy," he writes, "must simultaneously be an avenue to understanding and a spur to action, not an escape into inactive contemplation." Thinking, he agrees with the pragmatists, should be tested in action, and is shown to be true by the results of action. Now an action is a part of the process of nature. Hence in "following a mental process" we are engaged in an activity that "gears in it all points with the material happenings in nature." Material and mental changes are, in other words, "complementary forms of activity intimately bound together by a qualitative relation."

Professor Levy's view apparently is that both mind and matter are aspects of some underlying substance which possesses both physical and mental qualities. But since there was a time when this planet was presumably mindless, the material is, he holds, more substantial and more enduring than the mental. This being so, it is extremely important that we should know what Professor Levy takes matter to be. His answer to the question, "What is matter?" is, apparently, the same as the answer which Dr. Johnson gave in reply to Bishop Berkeley: "The word matter is used," he says, "for what we take up as pieces and objects everywhere." In other words, it is what we can see, touch, and handle.

But if you are going to make matter both the basis and the essential nature of what you take to be real, it is surely necessary to go in a little more detail into the vexed questions touching its nature. Matter, says the modern physicist, is a series of events, but the view that there is a continuing solid core running through the events obtains no countenance from modern physics. Matter, say the philosophers, is something which we experience and cannot, therefore, be conceived apart from experience. Professor Levy is impatient with the philosophers, but it is a little surprising to find that he dismisses as unimportant the analysis of the physicists.

These, however, are not really the questions which interest Professor Levy. His real concern is to apply his physical and metaphysical theories to the nature and development of societies. His account follows strictly Marxist lines. The social and cultural forms of a society are, he holds, the product of its technical development, but there is a time-lag before the social and cultural order adjusts itself to prior changes in technique. During this time-lag the inventions in technique by the application of which human life could be transformed out of all recognition are not permitted to be used for human betterment. The conclusion is that the social and cultural order which holds up the technical development, by means of which human life might be ameliorated, must be swept aside. Ages such as our own, in which an effete social order is palpably withstanding the pressure of economic and technological changes towards new social and political forms, are eras of frustration and disappointment. The failure to harness the forces of production to the well-being of the people becomes more and more pronounced, and the pressure of the revolutionary forces which this failure generates grows ever more insistent. We have two alternatives: one is to seek to arrest the progress of society to new social and political forms, freezing it, as it were, on the brink

of change. The other is to go forward to the next stage in social and political development, even if this means, as inevitably it does, a violent break with the existing order. The next stage, which is the stage of a classless society, will *necessarily*—here Professor Levy's determinism finds expression—supersede the present one. Hence all that human beings can do is to accelerate this inevitable change, and to make it less catastrophic than it might otherwise be, by consciously envisaging its inevitability and deliberately preparing for what they realize to be inevitable. "A historic analysis shows that we *will* do so and so. We might as well do it deliberately and with enlightenment." Hence the final object of philosophy, as Professor Levy conceives it, becomes that of "guiding ourselves and others towards this classless society."

This is no place for a criticism of the underlying Marxist philosophy which Professor Levy is, in various ways, seeking to apply. Two points may, however, be noticed. First, Professor Levy's training as a mathematical physicist has made him a determinist. As a consequence, he holds that the progress of society, and in particular its development in the direction of a classless order, is *determined* to take place. The laws in accordance with which it will take place are presumably what he means by "social dynamics." Whether a theory of history of this kind is possible or not, is open to question; what appears to be reasonably certain is that Marxism is not itself such a theory. Marxism entirely failed, for example, to predict the appearance of Fascism. Nor does Professor Levy advance any cogent arguments for thinking that the development of a classless society will *necessarily* be the next phase in human history. It might quite easily be a reversion to barbarism as a result of the revolutionary break with the existing order of society which Professor Levy regards as inevitable.

In the second place, Professor Levy makes much of the exclusion of teleological conceptions from his philosophy; the notion of purpose is to him anathema. Nevertheless, as the quotation given earlier in the review shows, he does on occasion lapse into the old-fashioned language which makes use of such words as "ideals." Philosophy in fact must help to re-shape the world so that man's "ideals may finally be achieved." It is pertinent to ask, "Whose ideals?" No doubt Professor Levy means that the ideals which are to be realized are his own; but suppose that they are the Archbishop of Canterbury's or Hitler's. No doubt Professor Levy would argue that the movement of history is inevitably determined to proceed in the direction of the realization of *his* ideals and not those of persons with whom he disagrees; but I cannot see that he offers any reasons for this view which, in the absence of them, must remain an expression of faith.

C. E. M. Joad.

The Moral Basis of Politics. By Naomi Mitchison. (London: Constable. 1938. Pp. xxi + 376. Price 8s. 6d.)

In the novels both of Aldous Huxley and of Naomi Mitchison there has been an expression of a growing interest in government and politics, and it is a symptom of the intellectual unrest of the present time that both should have felt the need to express directly their political ideals. Any reader who found Huxley's *Ends and Means* a stimulating approach to the moral and political implications of modern social life will certainly appreciate Mrs. Mitchison's book. It is a brave and honest and often moving attempt to

reveal the moral issues behind political systems and the conflicts they produce.

She begins with an account of the end at which we should aim. This consists in right relationships between people. (She admits, however, that "being ourselves" must be part of the good, and also that right relationships can hold only between good people, whose goodness must therefore be of some other type. Towards the end she allows further that there are some wicked and many "nasty" people who presumably cannot be encouraged to "be themselves." It is interesting here to see how her ideal of right relationships seems at first sight to be at the opposite pole from Huxley's ideal of "detachment," and yet how the working out of both ideals brings their practical expressions nearer to each other.) So we come to the need for change and to the resistance to change not merely in capitalism and in conservatism but in the ordinary man who has little imagination, no clear ideals, and something to lose. It is at this point that her two most interesting chapters come in: those on Violence and on Dilemmas. The only alternative to violence as a method of change is conversion or catharsis, and this catharsis or new vision is not merely an initial requirement, but a continuing necessity especially for leaders if they are to avoid the corruptions of power. Its methods of attainment are various; meditation, tragedy, contact with the people you represent, all these can recreate the vision which is needed to keep alive the spirit of fellowship. The chapter on Dilemmas shows how conflicts of loyalty arise and how they are sometimes intelligible as conflicts between long-range and short-range policies. This solution is applied in particular to the present dilemma in which the "left wing" finds itself between the long-range absolute pacifism of Lansbury and the short-range policy of "fighting the dictators." All through Part I the argument is alive and alight with admirable and infectious individuality.

Part II applies to political practice, the conclusions of Part I. It is also stimulating though much more negative and cautious. After an initial chapter shrewdly analysing the various motives for political action and the dangers they involve, Mrs. Mitchison concludes with the methods and difficulties of political reform directed to the achievement of her ends. Here she admits that one principal handicap is our almost complete ignorance of the actual wants of the people, a problem in which she hopes mass observation will help us.

Criticism of the argument in a review would be unprofitable for it would have to fasten almost entirely on her main premisses, and these she is not concerned to defend or to analyse. They include her account of the good (some doubts on which have been suggested above), her stress on economic class distinctions and on political remedies, with the socialism which is the consequence of this stress, her distrust of non-social values, and consequently of religions. But those who accept these fundamentals (and they are admittedly the audience for whom she is writing) will find her book attractive and enlivening, and even those who do not will find in her chapters on motives for political action and political inertia and on Pacificism and Dilemmas much of interest. Her book is difficult to classify, but in its humanity, its refreshing directness, its use of personal experience and its clear impress of the author's personality it recalls Graham Wallas's *Human Nature in Politics*. In particular it should form an excellent basis for a series of discussions by any group of people who are studying present-day politics with a view to understanding the general principles at issue.

J. D. Mabbott.

Beyond Humanism: Essays in the New Philosophy of Nature. By CHARLES HARTSHORNE. (Chicago and New York: Willett, Clark & Co. 1937. Pp. xiv + 324. Price $2.50.)

"Pragmatism," said Chesterton a generation ago, "is a matter of human needs; and one of the first of human needs is to be something more than a pragmatist." Similarly, begins Professor Hartshorne, "if the man of to-day leaves humanism, it should be to go beyond and forward." For at its best, he maintains, humanism simply expresses "an interest in man" which may degenerate into "a monomania, excluding interest in everything else"; or, still more severely, "the specific disease of humanism is the megalomania, the wishing to be God." In its stead he advocates an explicit Theism, but of a wholly new type based on a "New Philosophy of Nature," excluding all supernaturalism, and incorporating current quantum physics with a fresh metaphysics and theology derived from Peirce and Whitehead, James, Bergson, and Tennant; even Spinoza, in short, "to-day would be a Whiteheadian."

His ambitious and attractive programme is pursued competently and temperately, although his treatment rapidly becomes definitely technical and, to my mind, somewhat obscure. I found the style rather heavy and involved and (probably arising from this) the sequence of ideas not too easy to follow, so that while the wide diversity of subject-matter is undeniably impressive, it seems to me to exhibit some dissipation of interest rather than firm integration and lucidity. The most serious defect, however, appears to my mind to be the inherent incoherence of the author's cardinal principles.

Only theistic philosophy, he contends, can ever be "clear and consistent," although modern science and logic necessitate our rejection of earlier theologies. His own system is "theistic naturalism, or naturalistic theism," implying not merely any intimate interrelation between God and nature, but rather their absolute coincidence; and since this principle is fundamental, while I should take it to vitiate Dr. Hartshorne's final standpoint, I will state it unambiguously in his own terms. The keynote is Spinoza's *deus sive natura*: "God is simply nature," while nature, conversely, has a quality that "may be divine" and in virtue of which it is far more than our environment or any "mere collection of natural entities." Nature, then, is "a superhuman but man-including organic whole . . . an individual, living and psychic . . . a kind of God . . . the universe is divine, the supremely integrated conscious organism." Equally unmistakable is the resultant panpsychism: the theism is "panpsychic," exactly as pantheism is theistic and objective. As with most other forms of panpsychism, however, this commits us to what I should regard as an indefensible subjectivism, since "all sensations are located in the nervous system . . . feelings are the stuff of existence . . . electrons must feel" and remember, just as the "world-whole" possesses feeling—a viewpoint which is, incidentally, Bradleyan rather than, as the writer asserts, genuinely Hegelian.

In all this, obviously, the fundamental feature is the identity, or coincidence, between God and nature: to repeat, "God is nature"—the two "coincide." "The whole of nature, as really an organized whole, *is* God . . . God is really the Life of Nature." This conclusion, on the other hand, is substantially modified in so far as God is "the mind of nature . . . which is his body"; God is "the mind of the world-body . . . a supreme mind in a supreme organism . . . the cosmic mind"; and in this connection Professor Hartshorne appeals to our actual experience of body-mind relationship. But this, I believe, immediately invalidates the identity between nature and God, since it is plainly

impossible that God should *be* nature, and at the same moment "the mind of nature"; the first principle implies identity, the second distinction, though not of course separation. For we must note that Professor Hartshorne does not hold that God is the mind (or life) of nature within some yet more inclusive whole that incorporates both as, for instance, an Absolute of some sort might do. On the contrary, for him "God *is* nature"; so that to add that nature is God's body is just like saying that a man's body is the man himself, and, simultaneously, that the man is the mind of his own body. This is perfectly illogical, and it introduces a fatal inconsistency into the very centre of "panpsychic" or "natural" theism. If, on the other hand, we regard man as a whole which comprehends body and mind both together, this is simply the familiar theistic analogy to God and nature which the author categorically rejects.

But this illogicality is further intensified by the essentially personal attributes of God—will as "the only final integration . . . a purposive rational mind," and love: "God loves all men . . . the world-embracing love of God," while "a unified person is a synthesis of knowledge and love." Now not only is it characteristic of man's personality, but it also becomes increasingly characteristic as personality transcends its human phases, that it distinguishes itself, though once again without severing itself, from all else with which it is concerned. Every artist, for example, is inseparable from his art; but to say that he *is* his art is quite meaningless, and all the more so the finer the artist. Similarly, if God is genuinely personal, as Dr. Hartshorne contends throughout, then it is absolutely impossible for him to *be* nature, no matter in what sense we interpret "nature." In short, divine personality, and divine identity (or even coincidence) with nature, are logically self-contradictory categories, so that the author's attempt to combine them vitiates his theism. He intends, however, to publish a sequel, *The Vision of God*, so that it is only fair to await his fuller discussion of these difficulties.

In other respects the writer is a strenuous advocate of "the eternal existence of finite minds of some kind . . . a complete memory of all past events," and of indeterminism, for which he advances several weighty, though never, I think, conclusive arguments. It is surely too extreme to say that recent research "has been overwhelmingly unfavorable to faith in absolute law," and that "order cannot be absolute but must be limited by and blended with disorder." For to take "disorder" literally is to render even divine knowledge and will nugatory; certainly the universe may be "wilder than our dreams," but it cannot be ultimately disorderly in anything but some metaphorical sense; otherwise, the farther science advances the nearer it approaches a complete collapse which would ruin vast ranges of philosophy itself.

Towards contemporary humanists Dr. Hartshorne is severely critical. There has been a "decline in Russell's intellectuality," and he "has not kept up with the march of ideas," while "Santayana's materialism is essentially parasitic." But it may be left to these equally vigorous controversialists, as well as to Moore, Dewey, and Freud, to defend themselves against the author's strictures.

J. E. TURNER.

The Idealism of Giovanni Gentile. By Roger W. Holmes. (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1937. Pp. xvi + 264. Price 12s. 6d. net.)

The author of this book has set himself to explain what is essential in the "actual idealism" of Gentile, taking the *Sistema di Logica* as his text-book, and to compare it critically with other modern philosophies. In spite of his

attempts to read his own views out of Hegel, Gentile is much nearer to Fichte, not only in doctrine, but also in temper and purpose, and has concerned himself with fundamental epistemological issues which the metaphysically minded Hegel slurred over. Mr. Holmes sees this, and makes it the beginning of a general account of Gentile's standpoint and achievement, leading up to a fairly detailed summary of the contents of the *Sistema di Logica*. Such a summary was much to be desired, because the work in question is not available in English, and yet is the most complete and authoritative exposition of Gentile's main contentions: his radical condemnation of all previous systems of metaphysics on the ground that they made knowledge impossible; his "peremptory and definitive" critique of scepticism, which extracts from solipsistic premises what he claims as a logic and metaphysic possessing *a priori* certitude; his "logic of the abstract," with its revision and revaluation of traditional formal logic; his "logic of the concrete," which substitutes for the Hegelian dialectic one which is Fichtean in spirit, and sums it up in the formulae "Ego = Ego" and "Ego = Non-Ego." Mr. Holmes goes on to compare Gentile's philosophy with various forms of realism and with positivism, presenting it as a unique instance of a middle way between these extremes, and showing that the difference between Gentile and the realist or positivist is ultimately a difference between the questions they ask: they disagree about the very nature and function of philosophy. His own decision is in favour of actual idealism, as being the most humanistic philosophy, though he finds many flaws in Gentile's statement of the doctrine, and suggests improvements.

There has long been room for a book which should interpret Gentile to the English-speaking world. The present work has made a beginning of the task, but is far from having completed it. It points the way, though not clearly, to an informed judgment upon Gentile. The Italian philosopher has asked the old epistemological question, how we can be justified in holding our ultimate principles. He has shown suggestively how the mind, by its own free act, thinks, and finds in thought itself its guiding principles, and how all thought is a moral act. This is an account of the terms on which we acquire and accept our known world; and these are also the terms on which alone any metaphysic may legitimately be held. But Gentile also holds that, in thinking, thought creates its object, and gives to itself and its world alike their reality, the only reality which is conceivable. Thus his account of the genesis of knowledge becomes an account of the genesis of reality, his epistemology becomes not the basis for a metaphysic, but itself a metaphysic. Mr. Holmes thinks this transition is justified. The final judgment upon Gentile will turn largely upon whether it is so.

The book contains Americanisms, and is disfigured by some jargon. On page 164, lines 9–11, a plural subject is given a singular verb. On page 180, line 17, "categorical" should be "categorial." On page 34 occurs a statement which implies that Philo of Alexandria was a Christian

At the end of the book is a detailed bibliography of Gentile's writings.

H. A. Hodges.

The Christian Understanding of Man. By various authors. Edited by Dr. J. H. Oldham. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xii + 268. Price 8s. 6d. net.)

For the Conference, held in Oxford last July, on the Subject of *Church, Community and State*, elaborate preparation was made by the co-operation

of scholars in many lands. Only one of the projected volumes of essays, that on *The Church and Its Functions in Society*, was ready for the Conference. The Report of the Conference under the title *The Churches Survey Their Task* was published in October 1937. The remaining six books are appearing tardily, and this volume is the first of them. It falls into two parts. The first deals with some current conceptions and the second with the distinctively Christian. The first essay on *The Scientific Account of Man*, by Prof. T. E. Jessop, can be warmly praised for its lucidity of style and balance of judgment. Its purpose is to show that when science (physical and biological) confines itself to its own province, and theology minds its own business, there need be no conflict between the account science gives of man and the estimate the Christian religion offers. Very valuable is the description of the limitations and the resources of science, and the consequent distinction as regards authority between science as such and philosophies which sometimes claim to speak in its name. The second essay by Dr. R. L. Calhoun on *The Dilemma of Humanitarian Modernism* is good, but not quite so good as the first. The third, on *The Marxist Anthropology and the Christian Conception of Man*, by N. Alexeiev, is of high merit; it is adequate in knowledge and competent in judgment; it seeks to bring out clearly the points of contact between Communism and Christianity in its view of man, as well as the contrasts. It seeks to do justice to Communism, and the Christian conception is not that of rigid orthodoxy of the Russian type, but one that Christian theologians generally could endorse.

In the second part the fourth essay, by Emil Brunner, is much less narrowly dogmatic than I should have expected. He does not quarrel with science or philosophy; he accepts the modern scholarly view of the Holy Scriptures; and if he still inclines to use the old theological terms, he seeks to meet the thinking of to-day. He does not assert the total loss of the divine image in the Fall, but only its perversion, demanding its restoration by grace. The fifth essay by Austin Farrer is a capable discussion, inclining sometimes to be over-subtle of the whole subject, showing the contrast between English and Continental thinking, when compared with Brunner's. Dr. W. M. Horton's contribution (the sixth essay) is American in its alertness and up-to-date-ness. He deals mainly with the breakdown of standards in the thought and life of to-day. The last essay, by Pastor Pierre Maury, appears almost as an anti-climax, the *reductio ad absurdum* of Neo-Calvinism. The Christian anthropology has no contact or concern with general anthropologies. All it has to do is to assert the Biblical doctrine of man, son, and grace. This is not the place to show that; what is here presented ignores the greater part of the teaching of the Scriptures, uses the Scriptures dogmatically and not historically, and lacks the graciousness an exponent of divine grace should display. A genuinely evangelical theology need not be as exclusive or intolerant. The absence of an index is a serious defect, and will lessen the usefulness of the volume.

A. E. Garvie.

The Kingdom of God and History. By various authors. Edited by Dr. J. H. Oldham. (London: George Allen & Unwin., Ltd. 1938. Pp. xii + 216. Price 7s. 6d. net.)

This is the second volume of essays, prepared in connection with the 1937 Oxford Conference on *Church, Community and State*. The Table of Contents gives only the names of the writers; and each seems to be supposed to deal

with the whole subject. The first four essays seem to me, however, to present a special aspect, which might have been indicated in a separate title. The quite sketchy essay of Dr. H. G. Wood serves as an introduction, indicating the connections of the different aspects presented. The second essay shows all the fine qualities of Dr. C. H. Dodel as scholar and writer. He presents the contrast between Hellenic and Hebraic thought, the dualism of the eternal and the temporal, depriving history of significance, of the Hellenic view, and the presence and activity of the eternal in the temporal, inverting history with value, of the Hebraic view. He then outlines the conception of the Kingdom of God in the Old and the New Testaments. His dominant idea may be found in these sentences: "The Kingdom of God is not something yet to come. It came with Jesus Christ, and in its coming was perceived to be eternal in its quality. That eternal quality is manifested in turn by the continuous life of the Church, centred in the Sacrament in which the crisis of the death and resurrection of Christ is perpetually made present" (p. 35).

The first part of the third essay, by Dr. Edwyn Bevan, discusses a theological problem. If the sovereignty of God involves a close correspondence of natural event and human action, then there is this dilemma: if the natural order is rigidly fixed, human choice must be predetermined, or, if human choice is free, God's action in the natural order must be variable. In the second part Dr. Bevan describes the Christian conception of the Kingdom of God. He does not identify it with any stage in human progress on earth, any millennial earthly kingdom, but with "the heavenly hope which is essential to Christianity" (p. 69). Dr. E. W. Lyman contrasts the Christian conception of the Kingdom of God with "the evolutionary optimistic view of history" whether it be naturalistic or idealistic; and concludes that either is "left in a dilemma between a relativism which will justify each of our conflicting historical forces equally well, and a relapse from optimism to complete pessimism" (p. 87). He holds that "the Kingdom of God, in the Christian view of history, is a transcendent-immanent conception and stands for a transcendent immanent goal" (p. 93). It is God's rule *in* and yet *above* "everything that can be expressed in history." Its consummation lies beyond history, and yet it is present in "prophetic historic action on the part of both the individual Christian and the Christian Church" (p. 102).

The fifth essay, by Dr. Paul Tillich, runs to forty pages, and the sixth, by Dr. H. D. Wendland, to fifty. Both are marked by German thoroughness; but their standpoints are different. The first is on exile from Germany, and professes himself a "religious Socialist," the second still holding his chair in Germany, expresses his criticism of "the secular forms of Messianism" (p. 168). with great reserve. Both invoke what has now become an obsession in Continental thinking, the "demonic" element in history as contrasted with the "divine"; Wendland speaks of a Kingdom of Satan (p. 159). I myself do not believe that the introduction of this conception makes history any more intelligible. It would demand more space than I can claim to discuss these elaborate essays in any detail. Tillich rejects the interpretation of history in the *dialectical theology* and in the *nationalistic* (p. 130). He finds the "demonic" element in history in "the autonomy of the capitalistic economic system" (p. 132) in nationalism, which "must be described as neo-paganism even when it assumes no explicit religious form" (p. 134), and "dictatorial forms of government, in which the 'demonic' force of an unrestricted exercise of power drives men into presumptions towards God and the destruction of the human values which belong to the Kingdom of God" (p. 135). To these disruptive forces it is the task of the Christian Church "to represent the unity of the Kingdom of God" (p. 139).

According to Wendland the Kingdom is past, present, future, and is the Kingdom of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. History is *sacred* in so far as God's grace and salvation are present in it; *secular*, where men follow their own ways; and *church*, in so far as in the Church there is worldliness as well as grace and salvation. On page 154 it seems to me there is probably a mistranslation: "sacred history is present and active in, with, and *behind* secular history." I conjecture that instead of *behind* should stand *under*, in correspondence with the sacramental formula of Christ's corporeal presence. These aspects are worked out in a series of propositions. While there is a present judgment of God in history, this foreshadows the Last Judgment, which will mark the end of history. At page 189 Wendland, with great reserve, seems to offer a justification for the "German Christian" attitude in politics, although he recognizes the danger of the secularization of politics. The last essay, by Mr. Christopher Dawson, opposes the Christian to "the other countless traditions that make up human history" (p. 204); criticizes the Protestant issues of the tradition in Socinianism and Millennianism [*sic*], affirms the opposition of Catholicism to Liberalism, and exalts the Catholic tradition. His conclusion may be quoted. "In comparison with the optimism of Liberalism the Christian view of life and the Christian interpretation of history are profoundly tragic. The true progress of history is a mystery which is fulfilled in failure and suffering and which will only be revealed at the end of time. The victory that overcomes the world is not success but faith, and it is only the eye of faith that understands the true value of history" (p. 216). This essay is an anti-climax, not as regards its literary merits, but as regards its pessimism in regard to human history in contrast to the more or less tempered optimism of preceding essays. The use of the book is made much more difficult than need be by the absence from the top of the right-hand page of any distinctive heading. If the contents offered no such heading, the name of the author might at least have been given. Although it is difficult in this volume, because of its variety, to see the wood for the trees, yet one conclusion seems to be justified; the emphasis is on the *rule*, and not the *realm* of God; the Kingdom is God's sovereignty of grace, consummated in the eternal life, not the temporal, and not a social ideal to be realized in time on earth.

A. E. Garvie.

Christian Faith and the Common Life. By various authors. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xii + 196. Price 7s. 6d. net.)

The contents of the third volume in the series, following up the Oxford Conference, do not generally correspond with the expectations which the title might raise. They do not deal with the actual conditions of the common life, and the application of the Christian faith to them. Some of the essays have the advantage of a distinctive title, but others have not, although the contents might suggest one. The table of contents gives only the names of the contributors. In the *Introduction* Nils Ehrenström sketches the situation of Christian morals in the world to-day, and indicates differences and agreements among the contributors. Dr. Martin Dibelius offers a valuable survey of *The Message of the New Testament and the Orders of Human Society*, emphasizing the universality of sin, and the necessity of grace. The contribution of Archbishop Temple has no distinctive title; but it has a distinct purpose. While insisting that the Christian must apply Christian standards in all spheres of the common life, he also contends for "the widest possible survey"

of the effects of action, and justifies compromise as the only practicable best. The next essay, also without any distinctive title, by Dr. Niebuhr, appears to me in many ways the most valuable treatment of the subject. He shows how the fact of sin affects the application of the law of love in the solution of the problem of the common life. He is not sparing of his criticism of churches and theologians, and combines German systematic thinking with American practicability. Wemer Wiesner illustrates the theological reaction on the Continent to a biblical dogmatism; he distrusts human reason, rejects even the conception of orders, such as family, nation, as rooted in God's creative purpose, which Emil Brunner accepts as a basis for Christian ethics, and limits God's indications of His will to the Christian revelation and to individual instruments. He is specially antagonistic to the recognition of "the law of nature," as expounded in Roman Catholic ethics. His title is "The Law of Nature and Social Institutions." This world is "chaotic and tragic," and God's purpose in it is mysterious. The essay by Dr. H. H. Farmer on *The Revelation of Christ and the Christian Vocation* sketches the Christian viewpoint, aspects of the common life which confirm it, problems and difficulties which arise from it, and then concentrates on the problem thus presented to the Christian. He advocates a reliance on intuition rather than reflexion as a moral guide, but recognizes that there are safeguards necessary to avoid arbitrariness. He applies his analysis, the moderation of which must be recognized, to the question of war, and asserts pacifism as the Christian solution of the problem. In qualification of his pacifism let me offer only two considerations: (1) in a defensive war, surely the action of the aggressor has for the time suspended the "personal" relations, which carry the full moral obligations; (2) God's action in history is retributive, where this redemptive purpose is resisted; and such retribution may be necessary to the ultimate fulfilment of the redemptive purpose. Seeing that in a later volume of the series international relations are discussed, it seems to me this contention for pacifism is irrelevant to the special purpose of this volume. The last essay, by Professor J. C. Bennett, offers a clear and useful analysis of the *Causes of Social Evil*, objective and subjective, and offers a necessary protest against the indiscriminate denunciation of sin as the sole source of all such evils and especially against the frequent invocation of "the demonic." Rightly he says of this myth: "it is rapidly becoming a new catch-call which throws very little light on any social fact" (p. 175). This is the criticism of the whole volume which I feel compelled to offer. The discussion generally is too abstract; and it leaves the impression that there is so little agreement among Christian thinkers that no unambiguous marching-orders can be expected from the churches for any advance of the hosts of the Lord against the enemies of His kingdom. Nevertheless, there is so much learning and ability in the volume, as to demand and justify careful study.

A. E. Garvie.

Church and Community. By various authors. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xii +259. Price 8s. 6d.)

This volume is the fifth in the series, dealing with the Church, Community, and State, although it is the last to appear. Most of the chapters have their own distinctive titles, but these are not given in the table of contents. Dr. K. S. Latourette leads off with an *Historical Survey and Interpretation* in a series of propositions: (1) "Every community has tended to have its own religion"

(p. 3). (2) "Until about a century and a half ago, Christianity, where it was the predominant religion, was accepted as a community affair" (p. 5). (3) "Acceptance of Christianity by the community did not preclude a certain amount of unbelief" (p. 7). (4) Where this acceptance has taken place, "a tension has existed between the Christian conscience and the standards of the community" (p. 8). (5) "In Western Europe the Protestant Reformation did not diminish the intimacy of this relation between Church and community" (p. 9). (6) Since the latter part of the eighteenth century there has been "a divorce between Church and community" and the rise of sects (p. 11). (7) "As Christianity has either voluntarily abdicated or been rejected, the religious vacuum thus created has not remained unfilled" (p. 16). This disappointing record, however, ends in a warning: "He would be a rash prophet, however, who would forecast in this the collapse of the Church or the passing of its faith" (p. 17). Thus is the present situation set before us: I believe accurately, comprehensively, and succinctly.

Dr. Ernest Barker gives an acute analysis of the conception of community to show how varied are its factors, none of which by itself—common blood, soil, law, and government—is sufficient, unless it involves "a conscious and purposive sharing in a general way of life" (p. 31). Similarly, he analyses the conception of Church. "A Christian Church," he says, "is *sui generis* in its custody of the Word of God and in the duty of mission—universal mission—incumbent upon it under the Word" (p. 42). It rests its authority on divine revelation. In a historical summary he shows the gradual detachment of the Church from the community State. In the world to serve it must not be of the world in its standards, for it has a mission to the world, "its custody of the Word and the motion of the Spirit" (p. 60).

Dr. Marc Boegner deals with the *Church and the Nation* in relation to France from the standpoint of a Protestant. One sentence will suffice: "The Church is, and also ought to be, the only place where the citizens of a nation are reminded not only that the nation is not an end in itself, not only that the nation ought to be in community with other nations, for the sake of the common good of humanity, but still more and above all, that the ultimate end assigned by God to it is, beyond all national distinctions, the kingdom where God shall be all in all" (p. 81). The contribution under the same title of Dr. Hans Lilje is of unusual interest. The standpoint is German, but not that of the "totalitarian state." Indeed, with due reserve the author detaches himself from it. Recognizing blood and soil as the natural bases of nationality, he deprecates the notion of racial purity and lays the chief emphasis on history (p. 90). He affirms "the unity of the human race," and the inclusion of all nations "in God's plan" (p. 100). Neither the birth of a nation through the creative Will of God, nor the consciousness of its calling, can be used superficially as a means of self-glorification (p. 110). As a Lutheran he adopts the dualism of the creative and the redemptive order of God—world and Church—and deduces the principle that the standards of the Gospel cannot be directly applied to the nation. While seeking to influence the nation, the Church must maintain the independence of its Gospel (p. 113).

Dr. Manfred Björkquist expounds "the idea of a National Church in describing the Lutheran Church in Sweden, which embraces nearly the whole of the nation. He regards the close relation to the State as an advantage in affording the possibilities for reaching the whole nation and no hindrance to its necessary liberty; but admits that such a connection is not necessary. D. Stefan Zankov, a Bulgarian, and one of the most progressive of the representatives of Orthodoxy in the oecumenical movements, gives a comprehensive account of "nation and Church in the Orthodox lands of Eastern

Europe." That relation has necessarily been affected by the subjection of most of these lands to Turkish rule, the faith of these Churches is mystical, ascetic, and eschatological; and presents a marked contrast to that of Western Protestantism. Church and nation have here been closely identified. Dr. E. E. Aubrey deals with Church and community from the American standpoint, where the State exercises no authority over the Church, and the Church has to exercise its influence in a "melting-pot" of diverse nationalities only slowly growing into community. The last essay on the same subject by Dr. H. Paul Douglass is far too long (67 pages). It would have gained in interest if the descriptive parts had been shortened and the last section on "the elements of a possible solution" had been expressed in less sociological jargon. His conclusion is that the entanglement of the Church by "sociological necessity" makes its position in the community equivocal; and nevertheless, it can hope for "victory based, as it believes, on the congruity of the Christian religious objectives and insights with the objective faith of the universe and the corresponding basic needs and undying aspirations of man" (p. 259). On the whole the volume is one of the best in the series, and deserves study as contributing to the discussion of a vital issue of to-day.

A. E. Garvie.

Church, Community and State in Relation to Education. By various authors. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xii + 234. Price 7s. 6d. net.)

This volume is divided into two parts. I, The Crisis in Education, and II, The Crisis in Christian Education. The first essay, by Professor F. Clarke, with admirable lucidity states what the crisis is. In contrast to the totalitarian view, he argues that education must aim at a disciplined personal liberty under the authority which religion alone can give. Professor W. Zenkovsky gives after a discussion of the totalitarian idea and totalitarian tendencies and *Étotisme,* or the glorification of the state, and the Crisis of Secularism and other relevant matters, a most valuable survey of educational theory and method and its victory in Soviet Russia, of the conception of community (or volk) and culture in Germany, and of Education and State in Italy. He concludes that by awakening the Christian consciousness alone shall we "illumine the gift of freedom—through its development and not through its limitation" (p. 62). Dr. P. Monroe contributes a disappointingly complacent account of the "relationship of community, state, government, church, and school in the United States," which contains much interesting information, but offers little illumination on the problem. Mr. C. R. Morris deals with *the State and Voluntary Effort.* His argument may be given in one sentence: "The best thing our educational system can do to defend democracy is to turn out men and women who really enjoy and care for that vigorous individual life and work which would not be allowed to them under a totalitarian system. And this is what at present our democratic schools and universities are largely failing to do" (p. 105). A common ideal animates the three constructive contributions.

The second part deals with the Crisis in Christian Education. Mr. J. W. D. Smith seeks to show the difficulty of a Christian education in a community which is not Christian, and argues that it can only be met as the Church itself gains a clearer insight into the intellectual and spiritual issues involved. Dr. Kohnstamm pleads for an educational evangelism of which Christ will

be centre, and deals with the defects of traditional education, such as intellectualism, under-estimation of activity, false emphasis in distance from common life of the objects of faith, appeal to fear, neglect of the special needs of girls. He offers practical counsels on the Church's task. "X," who appears to be German, describes the present crisis of civilization and the educational problems arising from it; cause and effect of the universal cultural and educational crisis; the attempt to find a political solution giving rise to the problem of freedom; and in this setting indicates the Church's task. Dr. Oldham, who has arranged and edits the whole series of books, offers some concluding reflexions. In his judgment the crisis is a challenge to the Church, to vision and endeavour.

A. E. Garvie.

The Universal Church and the World of Nations. By various authors. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xii + 315. Price 8s. 6d. net.)

This is the last of the series of volumes following up the Oxford Conference. The chapters bear distinctive titles, and the volume as a whole shows more orderly planning than do some of the others. The Marquis of Lothian leads off with the *Demonic Influence of National Sovereignty*. He here expresses an idea, which seems almost an obsession: there can be no peace till national sovereignty is subordinated to a commonwealth of mankind; all other considerations are unduly minimized. I am sorry he has accepted that controversial slogan "demonic," as it seems to me to add nothing to our understanding of events. Sir Alfred Zimmern, who writes on the *Ethical Presuppositions of a World Order*, asks with reference to this idea "whether it is not a little unhelpful, and more than a little old-fashioned to fix on 'sovereignty' as the root-cause of the troubled condition of inter-state relations" (p. 52 note). He gives an acute analysis of four assumptions: "(1) There is a world order now in existence. (2) There is a world society now in existence, but it has not yet been reduced to order. (3) There is no world society in existence, and in the nature of things there never can be one. (4) There is no world order, and, humanly speaking, there never can be one" (p. 27). In his discussion of these lines of thought, he associates them "respectively with Cobden, Woodrow Wilson, Bergson, and St. Augustine" (p. 28). He is critical of them all. He states the problem as follows: "Granted the limitations of human nature, are there any issues on which it is reasonable to expect that *man's* social conscience can be relied upon to act as a permanent force in world affairs?" (p. 46). He concludes that these limitations "compel us, for the time being, at any rate, to abandon the hope of establishing anything approaching a universal system of world-order" (p. 50). He admits that there are relations among some nations so close that war is "unthinkable," and if such relations "covered the whole world, the problem of world-order, in its strictly political sense and within the limits of human weakness, would be solved" (p. 54).

The third essay, by Dr. O. H. von der Gablentz, treating the economic aspects, is too technical to be discussed here. The distinguished Swiss international jurist, Dr. Max Huber, deals with the *Christian Understanding of Law*. He approaches "the problem of the international, supranational, and universal 'as' an essential part of the greater problem: History and the Kingdom of God" (p. 101). "Law," he says, "is the sum-total of the rules which, by their claim to validity, order the external relations of human beings among themselves" (p. 102). It is generally only national in its scope. "Only

where the beginnings of a common ethic or of a large and permanent community of interest are present, can the international legal order go beyond the practice of concluding treaties" (p. 104). Only the Christian Church has created such "a possible basis for an international and supranational law." Such law has importance only in the measure in which "a right balance in the static and dynamic elements in the relation of nations is attained" (p. 118). From this standpoint *power*, *force*, and *war* are discussed. Regarding the argument against war from the enormity of the evil it inflicts, he says: "From the specifically Christian standpoint there is no room for the quantitative element in judgment of evil" (p. 121). As regards "the conscientious objector," while advocating all practicable tolerance, he states that "the claim of the citizen to be able to demand as a right that the State should renounce its claim upon him by taking his subjective decision into consideration, makes, in principle, the whole authority of the State an open question" (p. 124). He notes as one of "the elements of the present international law" which is a serious hindrance "the exaggeration of the idea of sovereignty" (p. 127). An ethic which would afford a basis for international law "must give a central place to the idea of justice" (p. 139); and the actuality of the relations of nations falls far short of this ideal. The obligation to create a just order remains, even if the prospect is not hopeful.

Mr. John Foster Dulles finds, as the title of his contribution, "the problem of peace in a dynamic world" suggests the source of war in the barriers which national boundaries impose on expansive human energy, and the solution in a removal or lessening of these barriers. Rev. V. A. Demant traces the roots of war in human nature in the frustration of desires, and emphasizes the need of redemption. The Rev. Wilhelm Menn offers a thorough discussion on *the Church of Christ and the International Order*. In contrast to the nations, "the Churches have a common ground which can make their meetings profitable, in spite of all political, national, and racial differences, one indeed which brings them from the outset into a positive relationship" (p. 206). Their *oecumenicity* should afford a basis for their *internationalism*; but, while it is necessary that the Church in each nation should become one with it, that God's redemptive purpose may be fulfilled, there is the danger of its becoming so nationalized that the One Holy Catholic Church becomes "a purely eschatological entity," and even "its missionary task is called in question" (p. 216). While preserving its internationalism, it cannot associate itself with any such, resting only on utilitarianism or materialism, and must even be cautious in its relations to idealistic humanism: but must maintain its own destructive witness to the Gospel. Its task is to give to its universal principles "a new interpretation and a new application in every particular instance and in every new historical situation" (p. 231). As a German the author on good grounds does not share "that naïve belief in a League of Nations," and offers some justified criticism of the League of Nations. He closes with the aspiration for the unity of the Church.

Dr. Otto Piper, dealing with *War and Christian Peacemaking*, accepts the Lutheran dualism between this fallen world, hostile to God, and the redeemed Church, and virtually limits its peacemaking to the discharge of its own distinctive task. The Rev. Canon Raven sets out with "sweet reasonableness" the case for *pacifism on the religious basis*. Much as I sympathize with his attitude, I cannot accept his argument as convincing, even from our common Christian standpoint. The volume as a whole leaves a depressing impression as showing how intractable the present situation is, and how slow must be the processes of the education of mankind to eschew war and ensue peace.

A. E. Garvie.

Business Ethics—Studies in Fair Competition. By Frank Chapman Sharp and Philip G. Fox. (New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1937. Pp. xi + 316. Price 8s. 6d. $2.25.)

This joint work of a professor of philosophy and a professor of business administration is full of meat. It is systematic, has humour, shows commonsense, and exhibits a special knowledge of the important problems of modern business.

The authors realize first of all that their title requires an apologia. It might strike some as a contradiction in terms. But, they contend (p. 3), "so far are business men from being without moral standards that the majority of them, like the majority of other people, have three. There is first the standard which John Smith applies to his treatment of other people—his competitors, his customers, his employers, and those from whom he purchases his supplies. There is, second, the standard which he expects them to apply to him. Finally there is the standard which he applies to other people's treatment of each other." These standards are applicable between buyer and seller, and between competing buyers or competing sellers. They deal mainly with questions of price. Thus the main topics discussed are fair price, including (Chapter XVI) that of property in ideas; fair treatment of competitors; and fair service of seller to buyer, including the questions of (Chapter III) intentional misrepresentation, (Chapter IV) "innocent" lies, (Chapter V) "let the buyer beware," and (Chapter VII) the limits of persuasion. The final chapters discuss the facts and possibilities of "moral progress in the business world"; they contain interesting pages (pp. 243–4) on the sense of craftsmanship as an Ally of Morality and (pp. 262–6) business men's luncheon clubs, such as Rotary.

As an economist the reviewer would like to testify to the timeliness of this work. He is particularly grateful for the chapter (X) on Corporate Management. The corporation, or, to translate into English, the joint stock company, has become by far the most important economic institution of our time. Yet apart from its legal façade, little is known publicly of its actual functioning and control. The examples the authors give of the practices of chairmen, presidents, and directors of oil and other corporations, not only exhibit the prevailing graft, which we are accustomed to hear about, but show up also the prevailing confusion of thought about the rights and duties of officers and shareholders. On more than one occasion in the recent United States Senate investigations of corporate activities we are told (p. 134) that "officials who had enjoyed the rights of dictatorship over a corporation for long periods of time without owning more than a very small fraction of the stock were compelled by the driving attorneys to admit that they had never before appreciated the fact that 'they didn't actually own the damn company.'"

Relations within the Corporation abound in difficult points of ethics. May a director, for instance, who is also an investor, buy or sell shares in his company according to his inside knowledge? If the information is disastrous he will want to sell. The only way such an official can (p. 136) "dispose of his stock with advantage to himself is to find someone else who will agree to become a stockholder. This means, in effect, that he must find someone who does not yet know of the disastrous information. The officer thereupon invites this person into the Corporation to assume his losses." All that is needed to make a perfect picture, conclude the authors, is for the directors "to write the victim a letter of welcome into the fold, together with pious expressions describing the zeal with which the management will care for the interests of the newcomer."

Modern economic institutions also discussed are Direct Selling, and the

Expert. "Many wholesalers have complained that it is unfair for the manufacturer to sell directly to the retailer and for the retailer to buy directly from the factory. They regard themselves as the victims not merely of an injury but also of a wrong." The authors discuss this by-passing of the familiar trinity of traders—producer, wholesaler, and retailer—under the heading (p. 152) "Is there a Sacred Way from Manufacturer to Consumer?" The ethics of the expert is discussed in a whole chapter (VI) called Knowing One's Business. The view advanced is that more trades should be protected from the charlatan and ignoramus as the State to-day, by registration and examination, protects the medical profession. Important also in the eyes of any economist is a salutary reflection on the ethics of the present unequal distribution of wealth. The authors rightly point (p. 192) to the large rôle played by chance and the cumulative effect of any initial chance success.

The book ends with a summary chapter giving some of the principal mistakes made in passing moral judgments. Mistakes include looking to actual results rather than to intentions, not taking into account the interests of *all* the parties affected, not considering circumstances, and being biased by private likes and dislikes for the persons concerned. But the great value of this book lies in its wealth of instances, often drawn from well-documented legal cases, fully disclosing names and circumstances. It is a pioneer book, as its dustcover quite truthfully remarks, and should lead to a new, up-to-date teaching of ethical problems in terms readily comprehended and accepted by an industrial community.

P. Sargant Florence.

A History of Cynicism, from Diogenes to the Sixth Century A.D. By D. R. Dudley, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. 1937. Pp. xii + 224. Price 12s. 6d.)

A history of Cynicism must have a double purpose, and may be judged in two ways. (1) Whatever its plan may be in detail, it has to portray the individual Cynics and their eccentricities. There is much legitimate entertainment to be had in this way, and Mr. Dudley, who is an excellent *raconteur*, has made the most of it. His idiomatic translations from the ancient sources are a pleasant feature of the book, and he leaves with the reader a vivid picture of life in the ancient world. On a more intellectual plane, but connected with this anecdotal purpose, there is the business of examining sources; much serious and well-judged research, which should come under this category, is included in Mr. Dudley's book.

(2) Philosophically speaking, the main interest of a history of Cynicism lies in its answer to three main questions: First, with whom did the movement begin? Secondly, what were the Cynic doctrines, if any? Thirdly, was there real continuity in the movement? (If a negative answer is given to the last two questions, I suppose that, in the narrower sense of philosophy, Cynicism has no philosophical interest.) The last point is an interesting one to consider. A long period, from Diogenes to the sixth century A.D., is covered by Mr. Dudley's book, and there are times in which we have to acknowledge a slump in Cynicism, if not its total extinction, especially between 200 B.C. and the first century of the Empire. Since the Cynics had no organized school, the thread of their continuity was bound to be slender; and it was a continuity in external things, the wallet and rough cloak, rather than in any ideas of which these were symbolic.

Clear answers are given here at least to the first and third questions. Mr. Dudley dismisses Antisthenes from the leading part, and instals Diogenes in his place, on very reasonable grounds. "The traditional view has been established by two interested parties—Alexandrian writers of *Successions of Philosophers* and the Stoics. The former wished to trace all philosophical genealogies back to Socrates wherever possible; the latter, desirous of showing themselves as the true heirs of Socrates, made great play with the connection of their founder Zeno with the Cynic Crates, and turned Diogenes into a Stoic saint." On the question of continuity, Mr. Dudley takes the view that the eclipse of Cynicism during the second and first centuries B.C. was not total. In Greece, it continued to lead a spasmodic and subterranean existence; in Rome, although the references by Latin writers do not all prove personal acquaintance with it, it does seem to have gained a footing in the time of Cicero. Mr. Dudley gives two main reasons for its decline in this period—firstly, that the varieties of "originality" were limited, and even Cynicism, by being familiar, became respectable; secondly, that it was alien to the Roman temper. And he accounts in this way for its revival in the first century A.D.—"luxury was more rampant than ever, and philosophy, even Stoicism, had compromised with it." I will only say, in criticism of this section, that the account of Thrasea and his adherents seems to me scarcely relevant; it is a pity to fuse Cynicism with Stoicism. But the very fact that this can happen brings us back to the second main question, What were the doctrines of Cynicism? This is not very clearly discussed in the book; I think Mr. Dudley generally takes it for granted that Cynicism was essentially personal and external, and he says that it "had no definite theoretical background," but it would have been useful to hear further argument on this point. The book at least leaves me with the impression that Cynicism is never more than Stoicism plus bad manners; and perhaps the best answer to give to this question is simply, "none."

D. J. Allan.

The Traditional Formal Logic. By W. A. Sinclair. (London: Methuen & Co. 1937. Pp. xi + 131. Price 4s. 6d.)

Mr. Sinclair has done a real service to all whose business includes the teaching of Formal Logic, by producing a book which confines itself to what may be called the practical side of that study, viz. the rules for the manipulation of statements and arguments. The ordinary text-book requires the student to dig out the practical rules from the discussion of theories on which they are supposed to depend, and when discussion has once got under way it seems almost impossible for an author to steer clear of matters which have nothing to do with Formal Logic. Mr. Sinclair has seen that Formal Logic requires very little theory and no discussion. Such theory as is necessary, e.g. the class doctrine of the proposition, he states briefly and clearly: the question whether it be true is irrelevant to the task of putting statements into logical form or arguments into syllogisms, and it is to enable the student to perform such manipulations that the book has been written.

The details of the book need not be dealt with here. Some teachers will regret that Mr. Sinclair has given such a meagre amount of immediate inference, and many will regret the omission of the old exercises on the rules of the syllogism—determining mood and figure from given data, etc.—but Mr. Sinclair is keenly alive to the danger of making Formal Logic too intricate and passing beyond the minimum likely to be expected of pass students or to be useful as an introduction to more advanced logic.

The aim of the book is to make it possible and even easy for the student to get up Formal Logic for himself without instruction, and the aim seems to have been achieved. Teachers who adopt the book should find that the time saved on helping students to use a text-book will be far more profitably spent on philosophical problems. Some knowledge of Formal Logic is necessary to every student of philosophy, and Mr. Sinclair is to be complimented on his success in minimizing the effort necessary to acquire that knowledge.

GEORGE BROWN.

Intuition. By K. W. WILD. (Cambridge, at the University Press. 1938. Pp. 240. Price 10s. 6d. net.)

This is a most likeable, lively and (if I may say so) a most intelligent book. Intuition is the name for so many different processes in so many philosophies that its frail thread of unity—not much more than the contrast between "within it and within," on the one hand, and "about it and about" on the other hand—is liable to snap under the kindliest pressure; and Miss Wild for the most part is "sceptical but impressed," as she says on one occasion. She has, however, a lively and catholic curiosity, a flair for penetrating analysis, and an effectively debonair way of writing. She has chosen a theme that suited her talent.

The first hundred pages or so seem to me to be rather less successful than their successors. She begins with Bergson, and produces what seems to me to be rather a congested account of a congested doctrine. In contrast her careful analysis of a great but slenderly evidenced question—the precise meaning of Spinoza's third grade of knowledge—reaches a high standard. An account of Croce follows, then an account of Jung (with excursus comparing him with Lévy Bruhl, Whitehead, and Wordsworth) then an account of Whitehead solus. This time-jumping and provocative method has the advantage of illuminating several of the different facets of a diversified and divisive subject, but it puts something of a strain upon the reader, especially since all the exhibits have been broken off from their historical antecedents. (When Miss Wild speaks of intuition as a "new name" in Spinoza's philosophy one is frankly puzzled. Was Spinoza not a commentator on Descartes? And if there had been no critical and post-critical philosophy, would Croce have dreamed of evolving his doctrine of intuition?)

The next and central part of the book is divided according to subject-matter. Intuition in religion, in morals, in aesthetics, is successively discussed, and is followed by chapters on genius, teleology, and axiology. In the chapter on genius the expository conjunction of Rousseau, Goethe, Henry Ford, and King David, Goliath's conqueror, is effective as well as bold, and Miss Wild has touched nothing that she does not understand much better than most.

In a short concluding discussion of about twenty pages, Miss Wild proceeds to compare definitions. She is convinced that there is something to clarify, despite the fact that, "the word intuition has been used by serious and thoughful writers in so many different senses that it has no clear meaning outside its immediate context, and often not in it." The notes of immediacy, inexplicability, and reliability seems to pertain to all serious accounts of "intuition," and it is nearly always held to be conformable to the spiritual rather than to the material. On the whole the idea that "intuition" is a prius in all knowing of whatsoever special kind seems to be less expugnable, to this author's mind, than any other; and I think we hear rather less in these definitory statements about the emotional penumbra of much "intuition"

than in the body of the discussion. In general Miss Wild is convinced that "a careless dismissal of what is intensely felt and persistently defended is not philosophic."

Miss Wild has had the courage to end her book with the brief paragraph "And so on," and that is not the only respect in which her short concluding chapter is more than usually courageous. She thinks she can "safely" draw fifteen positive conclusions, "which we may expect every one to accept," that she has disproved four propositions (a modest number) can show that four are improbable, but that fourteen remain possible. It does not seem to me that she has been as careful about accuracy of expression in this chapter as in the others, although the need for accuracy in it is obviously very great. In particular I do not think that II (4) on p. 229 is precise or even intelligible as it stands. But I hope I am wrong.

JOHN LAIRD.

Liberality and Civilization. By GILBERT MURRAY, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 94. Price 2s. 6d. net.)

Here are two lectures recently given at the invitation of the Hibbert Trustees in the Universities of Bristol, Glasgow, and Birmingham, by an author of world-wide fame. The loss of liberality he holds (whatever one's politics) is the legacy of the insecurity of the Peace. Unless men can devise liberal things, there is ruin before us, and there is still time for the revival of liberality, since it has not faded altogether into the Limbo of forgotten and fantastic things. The state of Europe is the poignant, pitiful theme of this tract for the times. "Nations can destroy one another if they will; they can save one another if they will. But no nation can destroy the others and save itself." Liberality and humanity go together and require a comity of nations. Liberality can still cast out fear, although we are so close to the abyss, and the author attempts throughout to give practical suggestions for the succour of a tortured world. His hope is still in the League of Nations, as is natural in one who has given such distinguished services to that body, and he does not believe that dictators can be liberal; but he is not more tendencious than his liberal spirit compels him to be.

JOHN LAIRD.

Punishment. By HANS VON HENTIG. (London: William Hodge & Co., Ltd., 1937. Pp. 239. Price 12s. 6d. net.)

This book by Dr. Hans von Hentig, who was formerly Professor of Penal Law and Criminology at the University of Bonn, is the translation into English of a German original from which the numerous footnotes, we are told, have been omitted. The book suffers from the circumstance that it is a translation, and it is manifest throughout that it is a translation of a German original. The effect is to give one a sense of effort in the reading, and though the style does here and there give promise of improvement, the effort has to be maintained to the end. Apart from this criticism which one has to make of the translation, the work displays all the characteristics that one associates with German scientific writing. There is a wide, almost an infinite, range of learning which gives to the chapters on "The Evolution of Punishment" a very considerable interest. In these chapters illustrations are drawn from ancient and modern history and from Christian and Jewish and Aryan and non-Aryan sources.

There is a useful chapter on "The Theories and the Purpose of Punishment." The dominant purpose that commends itself to the author is that of the use of punishment as a means of social selection, to which the old arrangement of purposes, reformative, deterrent, and preventive are to be subordinated. There is, however, a danger in allowing the criminologist a free hand in these matters. It is that the point of view of the criminologist as such is apt to be too narrow and needs to be corrected by a superior point of view, be it ethical or even political. Moreover, one feels that certain modes of punishment that may commend themselves to the criminologist for one reason may come to be used by the political power for another, and quite different, purpose, as in fact would seem to have happened with the introduction of sterilization into German law. It is perhaps in the irony of things that Dr. von Hentig should have advocated this new mode of punishment as long as twenty-one years ago.

The book shows throughout a certain scientific temper, and the author manifestly has all the material at his disposal. One feels, however, that his general philosophy is unacceptable. Thus, he attaches a great deal too little importance to intellect (p. 83) and is apt to deny the freedom of the will (p. 148). On these things the whole tradition of European law and punishment have been founded. With their denial other things of necessity must disappear: as, for instance, the idea of justice for which Dr. von Hentig appears to have very little concern in this book on punishment. Altogether, as a piece of writing directed to English conditions, one feels that the latest work by Mr. Leo Page on *Crime and the Community* is not only more readable but also of greater value.

RICHARD O'SULLIVAN.

Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, Volume XIII, Philosophy of Education. (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America. 1938. Pp. 232.)

Amongst the papers and addresses on education in this volume is a forceful plea by Dr. N. Murray Butler, who is speaking as a guest of the Association, for the intervention of philosophy in the realm of education; and there are several papers devoted to the part Scholastic philosophy may hope to play in making a theory of education for America. These papers contain much healthy self-criticism (as in the statement on p. 62 that "a Scottish child of eleven is at the developmental level of an American child of thirteen"), but at times they become somewhat naïve or overburdened with citations. However, since Aquinas left no explicit philosophy of education among his writings, it is reasonable that his modern followers should draw out the implications of what he did say on the human character and intellect.

Of more interest is the report of a joint-session with the American Philosophical Association in December 1937. Here Dr. Louis Mercier of Harvard defends Scholastic philosophy as a "dualistic humanism" against monistic criticism from Professor Blanshard of Swarthmore College. Perhaps Dr. Mercier neglects the importance of the idea of *analogia entis* in his exposition, and thus lays himself open to the charge that the Thomist account of the relation between temporal and eternal "runs off into mystery at crucial points."

The second discussion (pp. 147–170), between Dr. Sheldon of Yale and Fr. G. B. Phelan of Toronto, is concerned with the nature of the union of mind and body. Dr. Sheldon is for one-way action, of mind on body; while Fr. Phelan exposes the Scholastic conception of mind as a spiritual substance

and at the same time principle of unity to the growing and sentient body. It is valuable to see the points of contact and disagreement between Scholasticism and more recent philosophies here brought into general view, for much can thus be achieved to break the barriers set around Scholastic philosophy by its difficulties of language and environment.

J. H. Crehan.

"Piers Plowman" and Contemporary Religious Thought. By Greta Hort, M.A., Ph.D. (London: S.P.C.K.; New York: Macmillan Co. 1938. Pp. 170. Price 8s. 6d. net.)

The interest of this able and well-written book is not mainly literary, nor solely religious, as philosophy and theology were in close alliance. After an appreciative description of the poem, and a balanced estimate of Langland's knowledge of theology based on an examination of his Latin quotations, two chapters are devoted to the description of Man; then follow chapters on Predestination, the Atonement, and the Sacrament of Penance. In the Conclusion the author expresses her opinion that "Piers Plowman helped to prepare the way for the English Reformation, the characteristic of which is its catholicity," that it "is a theological poem, and that the key to it is the problem of the *salus animarum* as that presented itself to our fourteenth-century forefathers" (p. 159). If philosophy is as complete an interpretation of the world and life as the mind of man can compass, this problem may fall within its province. For readers of exclusively technical interest in philosophy, Chapters III and IV may advance a claim, for the author here deals competently with contemporary thought in the sphere now assigned to psychology. To enter into any details would demand more space than the book can claim, although it deserves this brief mention and commendation.

A. E. Garvie.

Immortality: A Critique of the Process of Nature and the World of Man's Ideas. By Count Hermann Keyserling. (London: Oxford University Press. Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. xvi + 232. Price 10s. 6d.)

This is a translation by Jane Marshall of a book published in Germany about thirty years since. It has been through three editions, and the author admits that it represents a stage of the problem he has now passed. But he considers it is a stage that others, seeking to approach the same problem, must also pass. Hence he allows it to be translated, and refers to other work, not accessible to the reviewer, as indicating his present position. This naturally makes reviewing not an easy task. Nor is it easy to put briefly the main thesis of the book. It may be stated, however, as follows. The individual is the fleeting shadow Hume declared him to be. But actually he is the ever changing manifestation of a supra-personal entelechy or energy, which is the expression of life as a whole. Only from that standpoint is the individual explicable or significant. Now this, of course, is really the biological aspect of the individual. He is the expression of the germ plasm. As such he is as immortal as life is. But in a world ultimately doomed to extinction, according to the second law of thermodynamics, this does not seem much ground for immortality. Consciousness is a very secondary product in the author's scheme of things. It is life, life as it is in cabbages and kings, of which he continually speaks. As

in the Buddhist conception, the individual dies every moment. There does not, therefore, seem anything very distinctive in this, and the book is the more tantalizing because of its rhetorical style, which does not suit its philosophical purpose. Yet it is worth reading despite its repetitions and obscurities. It is indefinite, and yet has signs of real insight. If the author would re-write this youthful manifesto in the light of his maturer thought, it might well be an outstanding book. As it is, it leaves the reader with a sense of dissatisfaction, for which, of course, he will blame the author, with an uneasy sense that perhaps he too is to blame for not being sufficiently able to think himself into the author's standpoint.

E. S. WATERHOUSE.

Books received also:—

J. HJORT. *The Human Value of Biology.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. xii + 241. 2 dollars 50; 10s. 6d.

T. G. MASARYK. *The Ideals of Humanity* (Tr. by W. P. Warren); and *How to Work* (Tr. by M. J. Kohn-Holocek, translation revised by H. E. Kennedy). London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 191. 6s.

C. G. JUNG. *Psychology and Religion.* New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. 131. 9s.

S. BUCHANAN. *The Doctrine of Signatures: A Defence of Theory in Medicine.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. 1938. Pp. xiv + 205. 7s. 6d.

S. A. COOK. *The "Truth" of the Bible.* London: S.P.C.K.; New York: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Pp. xix + 346. 9s.

A. C. MUKERJI. *The Nature of Self.* Allahabad: The Indian Press, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xii + 359. Rs. 5.

G. O'CONNELL. *Naturalism in American Education* (Preface by L. J. A. MERCIER). New York: Benziger Bros. 1938. Pp. xxvi + 285. 2 dollars 75.

W. F. OBERING. *The Philosophy of Law of James Wilson, Associate Justice of the United Supreme Court, 1789–1798.* (Vol. 1 of Philosophical Studies of the American Catholic Philosophical Assn.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America. 1938. Pp. 276.

T. G. MASARYK. *Modern Man and Religion* (Preface by V. K. ŠKRACH. Tr. by A. BIBZA and V. BENES. Tr. revised by H. E. KENNEDY). London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 328. 7s. 6d.

J. E. SHAW. *The Lady "Philosophy" in the "Convivio."* Cambridge, Mass.: The Dante Society; London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. 29. 3s. 6d.

S. CHASE. *The Tyranny of Words.* London: Methuen & Co. 1938. Pp. xii + 275. 10s. 6d.

G. N. M. TYRRELL. *Science and Psychical Phenomena.* London: Methuen & Co. 1938. Pp. xv + 279. 12s. 6d.

W. H. WATSON. *On Understanding Physics.* Cambridge at the University Press. 1938. Pp. xii + 146. 7s. 6d.

P. ROMANELLI. *Gentile: The Philosophy of Giovanni Gentile: An Inquiry into Gentile's Conception of Experience.* (Ed. by the Casa Italiana of Columbia University). New York: S. F. Vanni Inc. 1938. Pp. xi + 191.

J. COURNOS. *Hear, O Israel.* London: Methuen & Co. 1938. Pp. xvii + 163. 5s.

R. DAS. *The Philosophy of Whitehead.* London: J. Clarke & Co., Ltd. 1938. Pp. 200. 6s.

A. Coates. *A Basis of Opinion.* London: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Pp. xvii +461. 16s.

M. de Wulf. *History of Mediaeval Philosophy*, Vol. II. *The Thirteenth Century* (3rd English edition) (Tr. by E. C. Messenger). London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1938, Pp. xii + 379. 17s. 6d.

W. Lowrie. *Kierkegaard.* London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. xx + 636. 25s.

T. Singh. *The Psalm of Peace: An English Translation of Guru Arjun's "Sukhmani"* (Foreword by N. Roerich). London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. xvii + 122. 3s. Rs. 2.

H. N. Lee. *Perception and Aesthetic Value.* New York: Prentice-Hall Inc. 1938. Pp. xii + 271. 3 dollars 50.

P. W. Bridgman. *The Intelligent Individual and Society.* New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1938. Pp. vii + 305. 10s. 6d.

C. A. Ellwood. *A History of Social Philosophy.* New York: Prentice-Hall Inc. 1938. Pp. xiv + 581. 2 dollars 60.

M. J. Adler. *St. Thomas and the Gentiles* (Aquinas Lecture, 1938). Milwaukee: Marquette University Press. 1938. Pp. iii + 111.

S. C. Tornay. *Ockham: Studies and Selections.* La Salle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Co. 1938. Pp. ix + 207. 1 dollar 75.

Various Authors. *University of Oxford Committee for Advanced Studies: Abstracts of Dissertations for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.* Vol. X. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. v + 277. 3s.

F. W. Coker. *Readings in Political Philosophy* (Revised and enlarged edition). New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1938. Pp. xvi + 717. 17s.

H. Dayal. *Twelve Religions and Modern Life.* Edgware, Middx.: Modern Culture Institute. 1938. Pp. 250. 2s. 6d.

E. Jacomb. *The Lamp of Epictetus: Being Arrian's Lectures of Epictetus to Young Men Paraphrased into Modern English.* London: Methuen & Co. 1938. Pp. xiv + 320. 10s. 6d.

F. A. Voigt. *Unto Caesar.* London: Constable & Co. 1938. Pp. xiii + 259. 10s.

N. Kausika. *My Father in Heaven.* Nemmara (Cochin): N. V. G. Aiyer. Pp. iv + 259. 5s.; Rs. 2.4.

F. Yu-lan. *A History of Chinese Philosophy: The period of the Philosophers (From the beginnings to circa 100 B.C.)* (Tr. by D. Bodde). Peiping: H. Vetch; London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xx + 455. 25s.

R. B. Perry. *In the Spirit of William James.* New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. xii + 211. 2 dollars; 9s.

J. Rumney. *The Science of Society: An Introduction to Sociology.* London: Duckworth. 1938. Pp. 125. 3s. 6d.

M. Roberts. *T. E. Hulme.* London: Faber & Faber. 1938. Pp. 310. 10s. 6d.

J. Dewey. *Experience and Education.* London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Pp. xiii + 116. 5s. 6d.

K. W. Monsarrat. *Human Powers and their Relations.* University Press of Liverpool; London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1938. Pp. xvi + 289. 10s. 6d.

P. A. Schilpp. *Kant's Pre-Critical Ethics.* Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University. 1938. Pp. xvi + 185. 2 dollars 50.

R. V. Row, assisted by T. M. Janardanam. *The Heart-Doctrine of Sri Bhagavad Gita and its Message.* Mylapore: Suddha Dharma Office. 1938. Pp. xvii + 145. Free in India; Foreign: 2s.

R. B. Cattell. *Crooked Personalities in Childhood and After.* Cambridge at the University Press; London: Nisbet & Co. 1938. Pp. xi + 215. 7s. 6d.

J. H. Hutton. *A Primitive Philosophy of Life* (Frazer Lecture, 1938). Oxford at the Clarendon Press; Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. 24. 2s.

I. O. Wade. *The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from* 1700 *to* 1750. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Oxford University Press; Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. x+329. 18s.

R. P. Masani. *The Religion of the Good Life: Zoroastrianism* (Foreword by J. McKenzie). London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 189. 6s.

E. Bevan. *Symbolism and Belief* (Gifford Lectures, 1933–34). London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 391. 15s.

A. Combris. *La Philosophie des Races du Comte de Gobineau et sa Portée Actuelle.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. 286. Fr. 30.

M. Stefanesco. *Le Problème de la Méthode.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 361. Fr. 40.

L. Vialle. *Défense de la Vie.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 167. Fr. 16.

P. Ortegat, S.J. *Philosophie de la Religion: Introduction Critique: Étude des Systèmes Modernes.* Bruxelles: L'Édition Universelle, S.A. 1938. Pp. 476. Fr. 45.

L. Robin. *La Morale Antique.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 181. Fr. 15.

Varieś. *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* (Dirigées par E. Gilson et G. Théry, O.P.). Paris: J. Vrin. 1938. Pp. 345. Fr. 60.

R. Aron. *Essai sur la Théorie de l'Histoire dans l'Allemagne Contemporaine. La Philosophie Critique de l'Histoire.* Paris: J. Vrin. 1938. Pp. 325.

R. Aron. *Introduction a la Philosophie de l'Histoire: Essai sur les limites de l'objectivité historique.* Paris: n.r.f. Librarie Gallimard. 1938. Pp. 353. Fr. 55.

E. Diaconide. *Étude Critique sur la Sociologie de Herbert Spencer.* Paris: Librarie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence. 1938. Pp. 375.

L. Lévy-Bruhl. *L'Expérience Mystique et les Symboles chez les Primitifs.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 314. Fr. 45.

G. Matisse. *L'Arrangement de l'Univers par l'Esprit* (La Philosophie de la Nature). Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 275. Fr. 35.

G. Madinier. *Conscience et Amour: Éssai sur le "Nous."* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 143. Fr. 25.

G. Madinier. *Conscience et Mouvement: Étude sur la Philosophie française de Condillac a Bergson.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. ix + 481. Fr. 65.

A. Maier. *Die Mechanisierung des Weltbilds im* 17, *Jahrhundert.* Leipzig: F. Meiner. 1938. Pp. ii + 64. R.M. 3.60.

N. Hartmann. *Moglichkeit und Wirklichkeit.* Berlin: W. de Gruyter & Co. 1938. Pp. xvii + 481. Rm. 12.

H. Heimsoeth. *Nietzsches Idee der Geschichte.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (P. Siebeck). 1938. Pp. 27. Rm. 1.50.

M. Grabmann. *Die Introductiones in logicam des Wilhelm von Shyreswood.* München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 1937. Pp. 106.

D. Reiter. *Introduzione alla Vita delle Parole: Frammenti di un Diario.* Milano: Bocca. 1938. Pp. 117. L.8.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *Philosophy*

Sir,

I should take this opportunity to thank Professor F. Otto Schrader for the appreciative and encouraging review which he has written on my book, *Thought and Reality*, and which has been published in the January issue of this journal. He has been quite fair to me in it, and it is after some hesitation that I have decided to send this short note. There are a few points in the review, which, if taken as he tried to present them, will lead to some misunderstanding of Sankara's philosophy. There are, again, a few points of criticism levelled against Sankara, which, I feel, can be met reasonably from the side of logic.

Professor Schrader objects to regarding the Absolute as conscious, and says, with Duessen, that this is due to Sankara's anthropomorphism. On the other hand, he has no objection to treating it as supra-conscious. But the supra-conscious cannot be the same as the unconscious or infra-conscious; it must be more than our consciousness. The consciousness we have at this empirical level is not perfect; that is, for it there always remains some impenetrable core in the object. But in the Absolute this defect is removed. It is fully mediated immediacy or self-consciousness, in which the screen between the subject and the object drops. Of course, it is not consciousness in the ordinary sense, viz., consciousness of an object that is alien to consciousness. It still is consciousness for which the object itself is consciousness: it is our ordinary consciousness made perfect. It is for this reason that Sankara regards the consciousness of the self, not as its property, but as the same as the self. For the same reason many of the Western idealists too have called the Absolute by the name of Self-consciousness.

Our thought cannot form an epistemological ideal beyond such a Self. It is the most perfect type of existence that we can think of, and which we regard as the truth of our finite existence. That is why whenever we have direct experience of it we are said to reach the deepest depths of our being. We cannot think of deeper depths than that. Buddhism may postulate eight supramundane worlds. But the number of such worlds can never be definitely proved, and the question belongs to mythology, not to logic and metaphysics. The Absolute is postulated as that which transcends all thought, and so all relations. If from any world it is possible to think of a higher, then that world is still within reach of thought and has relations to the higher and the lower. So naturally that cannot be the Absolute. The Absolute is not what is merely supra-mundane, but what is beyond thought. The world of the angels is supra-mundane, but it is not the Absolute. Nor is it logical to postulate something beyond the infinite. Mythology may do so, but it is not metaphysics. Buddha was silent when the question was put to him about the Self or the Absolute; but the reasons for his silence were best known to him only. It would be dogmatic to interpret his silence as denial. But Sankara asserts the truth of the Absolute, because unreality, according to him, is unthinkable without thinking of reality as its basis. The Absolute is real as the basis of the world, which is relatively unreal.

The suggestion is made that *māyā* may be understood from the side of the Greek conception of the world as Being and Non-Being. But there is a subtle and profound difference between the two conceptions. *Māyā*, according to Sankara, is neither Being nor Non-Being, and is not a unity of the two. This point I have explained in my book, and need not repeat what I have said already. Or rather, we should say that Being and Non-Being are understood by Sankara differently from the Greeks. Non-Being is the admittedly unreal, which is never experienced as real. It is not what turns unity into plurality, or Being into Becoming; and it is not the same as absence or difference. It does not enter at all into the constitution of *māyā*. *Māyā* is an entity which is experienced as real; it is positive. Yet it is not Being or Existence, for the Absolute only is such. The Absolute also is positive, yet it is also

Being or Existence. It is for the reason that *māyā* cannot be treated as either existence or non-existence that it is said to be inexplicable. The Absolute also may be said to be inexplicable, but in a different sense, viz., that of being beyond thought, not in the sense that it is neither Being nor Non-Being.

Another suggestion is made that *vivarta* may be understood as creation from nothing. This seems to be a misunderstanding. At least Sankara does not understand it in that sense. The creation is out of Brahman, not out of nothing. But this Brahman does not change or undergo modification in the process. For example, when milk turns into curd, the milk is no more; its very substance is transformed. This process is called *pariṇāma*. But when gold is made into an ornament, gold is not transformed into any other substance. Similarly Brahman is the cause of the world; but this is a peculiar cause which does not change in the process. Such a process is called *vivarta*. Sankara does not accept the principle that creation can be out of nothing. On the other hand, he does not also accept the principle that every case of causation must be a case of *pariṇāma*. *Vivarta* is a peculiar concept, and its peculiarity should be as such recognized, and should not be understood in terms of any other concept.

I should like to add that the concept of creation as *līla* or play, though it does not seem to be explicitly mentioned in the Upanishads, is yet found in the *Brahmasūtras* (ii. 1, 33), which are an interpretation of the Upanishads. And all the commentators of the *Brahmasūtras* accept the concept of *līla* as expressing the Upanishadic view. I therefore attributed it to the Upanishads, though I could have been more definite. This and a few lapses will be corrected in a second edition when that is required; *twlāvidyā* is not a misprint for *sthūlāvidyā*, but for *tulāvidyā*.

I again thank Professor Schrader for introducing my book to the Western readers as important and comprehensive. And it will give me much gratification if the readers take, not merely antiquarian, but philosophical interest in it.

P. T. Raju.

Andhra University, Waltair,
May 13, 1938.

To the Editor of *Philosophy*

Sir,

When a review by one eminent philosopher of another's work is admitted to be not a review but a "grouse," and a "grouse" declared to be justified, some reply seems called for on behalf of those readers who value the work in question.

Professor A. E. Taylor's complaint (in *Philosophy*, April 1938) against Mr. Santayana's book, *The Realm of Truth*, includes two charges: first, that his "verbal graces," "picturesque metaphors," impair the effect of his work—obscure that straightforward statement of meaning he could give us if he would: secondly, that these freely indulged metaphors are actually no mere adornment but "pieces of a myth, and a myth which impresses one as false." To the second of these charges no reply need be made. That one philosopher's system should appear to another reviewing it as false, or inadequate, is a result for which we are all prepared. What surprises is that those metaphors which at one moment are characterised as parts of Santayana's essential myth, should also be spoken of as deviations from the honest effort to communicate meaning. It is just this point that I wish to contest.

It seems to me that many philosophers are rightly realizing—to-day perhaps more than ever before—that our clearest renderings of reality, whether couched in austere conceptual terms or variegated with abundant imagery, may with equal justice be described as myths—myths in the sense of partial renderings from some human, historically conditioned standpoint of what necessarily transcends human grasp. In Santayana's work, it seems to me, a reader at all in sympathy with his standpoint can feel the effort of a sincere mind to render exactly, now by logical statement, now by brilliant imagery, the outlook to which the writer's experience and powers

constrain him; and if in some important respect such a reader differs from the author's conclusions, still the clarity of exposition, in its untechnicality and variety of literary presentation, enables one to enter imaginatively the distinctive outlook and to measure and clarify one's own thought against it.

Yours faithfully,
MAUD BODKIN.

2 NORTH GROVE,
HIGHGATE N.6.,
April 1938.

TO THE EDITOR OF *Philosophy*

SIR,

May I protest against the last paragraph of the review of Canon Green's *The Problem of Art* in your April number? Your reviewer hopes that the author "will enjoy a *succès de scandal* [*sic*] . . . because he has seen through the meaningless rigmarole of the Neapolitan quack."

I have had, in my time, occasion to express disagreement not only with Croce and Canon Green but also with your reviewer. I hope nothing was lost in explicitness by trying to follow the urbane tradition of Hume and Butler, rather than the bad manners of Bradley.

The passage in Canon Green thus commended seems to me an inadequate interpretation of Croce.

Yours, etc.,
E. F. CARRITT,

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
OXFORD,
April 8, 1938.

THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY

(*Incorporated under the Companies Acts* 1908–1917 *as a Company not for Profit but limited by Guarantee.*)

President:
THE RT. HON. VISCOUNT SAMUEL, G.C.B., G.B.E., M.A., HON.D.C.L.

Chairman of the Council:
J. H. MUIRHEAD, M.A., LL.D., F.B.A.

Deputy Chairman of the Council:
A. D. LINDSAY, C.B.E, M.A., LL.D.

Hon. Treasurer:
THE RT. HON. LORD TWEEDSMUIR, C.H., G.C.M.G., D.C.L.

Director of Studies:
SYDNEY E. HOOPER, M.A.

Hon. Secretary:
P. M. ROSSDALE, LL.M.

INSTITUTE NOTES

The Syllabus of Lectures and Evening Meetings for the Session 1938–39 is now in course of preparation, and will be sent to members in the early autumn.

OBJECTS OF THE INSTITUTE.

The British Institute of Philosophy exists to bring leading exponents of various branches of Philosophy into direct contact with the general public, with the purpose of satisfying a need felt by many men and women in every walk of life for greater clearness and comprehensiveness of vision in human affairs.

With this broad educational purpose in view, the Institute—

(1) Provides at suitable times in the day and evening courses of lectures by leading exponents in the more important subjects coming within the scope of Philosophy. All branches of Philosophy are represented—Ethics and Social Philosophy, the Philosophy of Law and of the Sciences, of the Fine Arts and of Religion, as well as Logic and Metaphysics and Psychology.
These lectures are free to members.
(2) Issues a quarterly philosophical journal (free to members).
(3) Proposes to form a philosophical Library.
(4) Gives guidance and assistance to individuals in their philosophical reading.

(5) Encourages research in Philosophy.
(6) There are Local Centres of the Institute at Bangor, Cardiff, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle and Durham, and Sheffield.

Further information and forms of application for membership may be had on application to the Director of Studies, at University Hall, 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C. 1.

[Suggested]

FORM OF BEQUEST

I bequeath to THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY the sum of ..... free of duty, to be applied to the purposes of that Institute, and I declare that the receipt of the Honorary Secretary, or other proper officer for the time being of that Institute, shall be sufficient discharge for the same.

MACMILLAN

PSYCHOLOGY DOWN THE AGES

By C. SPEARMAN, Ph.D. (Leipzig), F.R.S.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

2 Volumes. With Illustrations. 30s. net

"It is comprehensive in scope, straightforward in manner, and so clearly and easily written that, for all that it is a text-book, the reading of it is never a task and often a pleasure. . . He makes the study of psychology so clear and simple a matter, that it is only when one remembers other text books on the subject that one realizes, by contrast, the nature of the achievement that the clarity of presentation, the simplicity of style, entail. The book is likely to become a standard work on the subject; it is a psychological classic."—C. E. M. Joad (*New Statesman & Nation*).

"*Psychology Down the Ages* is an eminently sane, judicious, and scientifically balanced work, easy to read and understand, and (to borrow the words of a reviewer of a former work of Spearman and apply them to this) the 'most distinguished British contribution to experimental psychology that has been made in recent years.' Indeed, both in comprehensiveness and clarity, it excells *The Abilities of Man*."—Dr. F. Aveling (*Nature*).

"These volumes will remain for some years the most reliable and complete of all modern histories of Psychology."—*Belfast News-Letter*.

CRITICAL REALISM

Studies in the Philosophy of Mind and Nature

By G. DAWES HICKS, M.A., Ph.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON 15s. net

"We heartily commend the whole volume to the careful study of a wider public, since it exhibits a fine specimen of exact thinking by one of the best of our contemporary British philosophers."—Prof. Maurice Relton (*Church of England Newspaper*).

TIME, CAUSE AND ETERNITY

The Forwood Lectures at Liverpool, 1935

By J. L. STOCKS

THEN PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

With a Foreword by the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK 6s. net

"The studied moderation of the language and the careful and usually successful striving for clarity of expression form a striking comment upon Dr. Temple's words concerning Stocks's devotion to exact thinking and the stern self-discipline which he exercised over the tendencies of his thought."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

MACMILLAN

The Message of the Gita

as interpreted by
SRI AUROBINDO
edited by **ADILBARAN ROY**

This book is a scholarly exposition of the famous Gita. It includes the full text of the Gita in Sanskrit, with a lucid English translation and capacious notes compiled from Sri Aurobindo's *Essays on the Gita* 7s. 6d. net

George Allen & Unwin

TWELVE RELIGIONS AND MODERN LIFE

by Har Dayal, M.A., Ph.D.

2s. 6d. net

"Twelve religions, including Christianity, Judaism and the religions of the East, considered from the standpoint of modern humanism."—*Times Literary Supplement.*

"This book is heartily welcome. The approach to the great religions, discussed in its pages, is wholly admirable."
Modern Mystic

"Dr. Dayal's unusual work."
Public Opinion

Modern Culture Institute
Edgware (Middx).

"an active mind . . . well equipped"
NORTHERN CHRONICLE

"bold and challenging"
ABERDEEN PRESS AND JOURNAL

This is the consensus of opinion of Mr. J. M. Lowson's book SCIENCE AND REALITY, in which the author discusses his interpretation of the Universe and its evolution.

Cheap edition, 2s. net

WATTS & CO.
Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

PHILOSOPHY

★

All applications for Advertising space should be addressed to

T. G. SCOTT & SON
LIMITED
63 LUDGATE HILL,
LONDON, E.C. 4

★

Telephone: CITY 4211 (2 lines)

CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM: The Very Rev. W. R. Inge, K.C.V.O., D.D., F.B.A.	387
II.	THE ETHICAL DOCTRINE OF HOBBES: Professor A. E. Taylor	406
III.	OUR EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS: Professor H. H. Price	425
IV.	WILL AND ACTION IN ETHICS (II): Professor J. L. Stocks	457
V.	DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA: Professor C. D. Broad	466
VI.	PHILOSOPHICAL SURVEY: PHILOSOPHY IN ITALY	476
VII.	NEW BOOKS	479
VIII.	CORRESPONDENCE	508
IX.	INSTITUTE NOTES	509

THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY

Appeal for New Members and Donations

The Council appeals to members to do all in their power to introduce new members in order to extend the benefits of the Institute and to increase its revenue.

The Institute has no endowments, and its work, which includes lecture courses and meetings for discussion in the various Centres, as well as the conduct of the Journal, cannot be carried on from revenue derived solely from subscriptions of £1 1s. per annum. The Council, therefore, appeals for donations, small or large, from sympathizers with the Institute's aims.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY UNWIN BROTHERS LIMITED
LONDON AND WOKING